

College

Composition and Communication

THE OFFICIAL BULLETIN OF THE CONFERENCE ON
COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND COMMUNICATION

EDITOR

FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, *Duke University*

EDITORIAL BOARD

GEORGE ARMS, *University of New Mexico*; NATALIE CALDERWOOD, *University of Kansas*;
FRANCIS CHRISTENSEN, *University of Southern California*; HARRY H. CROSBY,
Boston University; SUMNER IVES, *Tulane University*;
FERDINAND J. WARD, C.M., *DePaul University*

Vol. IX

October, 1958

No. 3

Panel and Workshop Reports
Conference on College Composition and Communication
Hotel Benjamin Franklin, Philadelphia, March 27-29, 1958

PANELS

I. TECHNIQUES OF SENTENCE STRUCTURE IN COMPOSITION.....	135
II. SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR SUPERIOR STUDENTS.....	137
III. FORMING ATTITUDES TOWARD NEWS REPORTING.....	139
IV. THE GRADUATE ASSISTANT AS TEACHER OF THE FRESHMAN COURSE.....	141
V. NATIONAL STANDARDS AND ACCREDITATION.....	142
VI. STANDARD LITERATURE IN THE FRESHMAN COURSE.....	145
VII. MAINTAINING PROFICIENCY BEYOND THE FRESHMAN YEAR.....	147
VIII. CURRENT EXPERIMENTS IN TEACHING.....	149
IX. RELEVANCE OF AMERICAN STUDIES TO THE FRESHMAN COURSE.....	149
X. MUTUAL APPRAISAL—COLLEGE COMPOSITION AND HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH.....	151
XI. REMEDIAL ENGLISH: LUXURY OR NECESSITY?.....	153
XII. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TEACHING READING.....	154

FOUR-SESSION WORKSHOPS

A. SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES.....	155
B. ADVANCED DISCUSSION OF LINGUISTICS.....	156
C. THEME READING AND GRADING.....	159
D. SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES.....	162
E. TEACHING STUDENTS TO WRITE FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY.....	164
F. THE ADVANCED COURSE IN EXPOSITORY WRITING.....	165
G. GRAMMAR: WHAT KIND AND HOW MUCH?.....	167
H. THEORY IN COMMUNICATION.....	170
I. THE ROLE OF THE COURSE IN GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	172

TWO-SESSION WORKSHOPS

1. ADMINISTERING THE LARGE FRESHMAN PROGRAM.....	174
2. INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION OF LINGUISTICS.....	176
3. THE RESEARCH PAPER: A REAPPRAISAL.....	177
4. THE COURSE SYLLABUS: PREPARATION, CONTENT, USE.....	179

College Composition and Communication is published in February, May, October, and December. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year, single copies, 75c. Entered as second class matter May 7, 1954, at the Post Office at Champaign, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Orders and business correspondence should be addressed to J. N. Hook, 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. All other communications should be addressed to Francis E. Bowman, 324 Allen Building, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

COPYRIGHT, 1958, BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

5. MAINTAINING STANDARDS IN RISING ENROLLMENTS.....	181
6. THE FRESHMAN ANTHOLOGY: VIRTUES AND SHORTCOMINGS.....	183
7. RHETORICAL INVENTION: GOOD SUBJECT MATTER FOR COMPOSITION.....	184
8. USES OF LOGIC IN THE FRESHMAN COURSE.....	186
9. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE COMMUNICATIONS COURSE.....	188
10. DETERMINING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING.....	189
11. THE RHETORIC OF THE PARAGRAPH.....	191
12. ARTICULATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE WORK.....	192
13. ENTRANCE AND PLACEMENT TESTS.....	196
14. USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCE.....	197
15. THE FRESHMAN HANDBOOK: A CLOSE LOOK.....	199
16. INCREASING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY.....	200
SECRETARY'S REPORTS NUMBERS 20, 21, 22— <i>Joseph A. Rogers</i>	203

National Council of Teachers of English Conference on College Composition and Communication

1958 OFFICERS

ROBERT E. TUTTLE, Chairman General Motors Institute	JOSEPH A. ROGERS, Secretary St. Louis University
ALBERT R. KITZHABER, Associate Chrm. University of Kansas	J. N. HOOK, Treasurer 704 S. Sixth St., Champaign, Illinois
GLENN LEGGETT, Assistant Chairman University of Washington	FRANCIS E. BOWMAN, Editor Duke University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Universities	Technical Schools
WILLIAM BUCKLER, New York University	RUSSELL COSPER, Purdue University
ALLEN CHESTER, University of Pennsylvania	BRYSON JAYNES, Washington State College
FRANCIS CHRISTENSEN, Southern California	DAVID MALONE, Auburn
IRWIN GRIGGS, Temple	STEWART MORGAN, Texas A & M
ALFRED GROMMON, Stanford	H. ALAN WYCHERLEY, U. S. Naval Academy
SUMNER IVES, Tulane	
KENNETH KNICKERBOCKER, University of Tennessee	
JAMES MCCRIMMON, Illinois	
DOROTHY E. MOULTON, Bowling Green State University	
GEORGE STOUT, Washington University	
PRISCILLA TYLER, Western Reserve University	
JOHN WEIMER, Michigan	
Liberal Arts Colleges	Junior Colleges
NICK AARON FORD, Morgan State College	CATHERINE ADLER, Joliet, Illinois
W. NELSON FRANCIS, Franklin and Marshall, Lancaster, Pa.	BEVERLY FISHER, Santa Monica
T. J. KALLSEN, Stephen F. Austin, Nacogdoches, Tex.	LEON REISMAN, Minnesota, Minneapolis
G. A. PECK, Brooklyn College	SAMUEL WEINGARTEN, Wright
WALTER PRAUSNITZ, Concordia, Moorhead, Minn.	
PAUL ROBERTS, San Jose State	
RALPH SINGLETON, Oberlin, Ohio	
Teachers Colleges	Editorial Board
MARY E. FOWLER, T. C. of Conn., New Britain	GEORGE ARMS, New Mexico
H. W. RENINGER, Iowa State, Cedar Falls	NATALIE CALDERWOOD, Kansas
GEORGE SMOCK, Terre Haute, Ind.	FRANCIS CHRISTENSEN, Southern California
RHODES STABLEY, Indiana (Pa.) State	HARRY H. CROSBY, Boston University
WILLIAM SUTTON, Ball State, Muncie, Ind.	SUMNER IVES, Tulane
	FERDINAND J. WARD, C.M., DePaul

Members of N.C.T.E. Board of Directors
 RICHARD S. BEAL, Boston University
 MRS. MARGARET BLICKLE, Ohio State
 MARGARET M. BRYANT, Brooklyn College

Representative to N.C.T.E. College Section
 T. A. BARNHART, St. Cloud

820.6
C68
V.9
no.3

Panels

I. *Techniques of Sentence Structure in Composition*

Summaries of the papers are presented below. Estimated attendance was 150.

Grammar and Sentence Structure

Robert C. Pooley

At present we very greatly need a shift to a structural viewpoint in the grammar handed down by tradition and taught in our schools. This panel will attempt to suggest that the composition teacher is essentially concerned with the combination of elements of communication to achieve not only understanding, but also good form, even elegance and esthetic satisfaction. To further these ends he can utilize the resources of the grammar now at hand, moving, however, to a grammar of combination and permutation whose purpose is to teach the infinite variety in English patterns.

My suggestion is that the applications of grammar to a college composition course should be dynamic and positive. To this end I venture to offer a series of specific activities and applications of grammar in the basic composition course.

Step I. By means of a carefully constructed test administered early in the course, ascertain the knowledge of basic grammatical terms necessary for college work possessed by each student.

Step II. A study of the resources of the simple sentence by comparing its basic formula—S-V-O—with all the variations which can be created by inversions and the manipulations of modifiers.

Step III. A study of subordination.

Step IV. A study of parallelism, in which the attention of the student is always focussed on what happens when he employs such structures.

To me the whole purpose of grammar is to accomplish the end of compact, efficient sentence structure. This goal is the only excuse for teaching parts of speech,

elements of the sentence, and the various processes of syntax.

Teaching the Patterns of English Sentences

Robert M. Gorrell

Before giving up in the face of discouraging results, I should like to give grammar another chance. I should like to try teaching grammar as a description of the English rather than the Latin language, and I should like to approach it from the point of view of patterns in the English sentence rather than from definitions of parts of speech. I propose, then, that we study sentence patterns on the basis of a simplified—admittedly oversimplified—functional grammar—that is, a grammar which describes the language primarily in terms of what parts of the sentence do. What I want to present here is a kind of outline in two parts. The first is a statement of a series of assumptions on which I would base discussions of sentence patterns. The second part mentions ways in which I think discussions of patterns can be clarified—or exploited.

1. Three basic kinds of relationships are revealed by English grammar. The first is the subject-verb-complement relationship. The second is co-ordination, the relation of parallelism or equality. And the third is subordination, including modification.

2. These relationships are revealed primarily in English by word order, secondarily by function words, and in some special instances by form changes or inflection.

3. The patterns of sentences can be described in terms of these relationships by considering the main functional elements in them—that is, subject, verb, complement, modifiers, and function words—without any classification of the

words of the language into parts of speech.

4. Because of their complexity, sentence patterns cannot be and should not be considered as structures separate from meaning and logic.

5. Patterns of English sentences beyond the basic structure of the simple sentence are of infinite variety and complexity.

The second part of the outline offers some specific comments on the teaching of patterns.

1. *Nonsense Syllables.* I have found nonsense syllables generally useful in teaching at least basic structure.

2. *Choice of Subject.* The student writer can often improve his sentence when he understands patterns that vary the subject.

3. *Patterns and Meaning.* For teaching, I think that there are distinct advantages in combining structure and meaning—that is, in studying specifically the different semantic implications of different sentence patterns and the varying semantic interpretations to be derived from the same pattern.

4. *Complexity of Patterns.* Students need to understand the basic structures, but they need also to be aware of the wide complexities and varieties of structures with modifiers.

The kinds of studies I have been suggesting can help, but finally one learns sentence patterns by seeing them, seeing them often, analyzing them, and using them.

Usage and Grammar in College Composition
J. N. Hook

A majority of our students neither learn to describe facets of the language with accuracy nor—more important—to use the language with ease and discrimination. I should like to glance at four reasons why so many English teachers,

despite obvious poor results, persist in their daily exercises in futility.

The first reason is tradition. The second is a lack of clarity in objectives. The description of language should be incidental; the use should be primary. Third among the reasons is teachers' lack of knowledge and ingenuity. It takes no ingenuity and little knowledge to take apart a sentence in a workbook. Having the students build sentences is less simple. The last reason is that the superior method—sentence building—appears to be more time-consuming, especially in grading papers.

I shall conclude by describing briefly three examples of application of the sentence-building technique. As a first example, let us suppose that you have students who confuse the cases of personal pronouns. If you believe in sentence building, you think first about the occasions when problems in case arise; then you construct pairs of sentences, to be combined by your students. As a second example, we may assume that in your last batch of papers you found that several students wrote excessively short sentences or *and . . . and* sentences. You select for class discussion an appropriate group of such sentences and explore their permutations and combinations, simultaneously adding depth to the content. As a final example, I shall mention the sort of sentence difficulty that eludes classification. A few typical representatives can be discussed in class with profit. Here, even more than with other sentence difficulties, stress upon the meaning is of value.

I believe that a thorough understanding of grammar and principles of usage has a sturdy value for any writer. I do not believe that the study of grammar as definition and classification leads to this thorough understanding. I am pleading, therefore, for teaching in which labels will be recognized as labels, teaching in which grammatical concepts will be

taught inductively, and teaching in which the emphasis will be steadily upon using the language clearly and effectively.

Participating Chairman: Robert C. Pooley,
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Speakers: Robert M. Gorrell, University of Nevada, Reno

J. N. Hook, Executive Secretary, NCTE

Recorder: Jayne C. Harder, Youngstown University, Ohio

II. *Special Treatment for Superior Students: Problems and Procedures*

Chairman Charles E. Blackburn of Washington State College introduced to an audience of about 100 the members of Panel II on Special Treatment for Superior Students: Problems and Procedures.

The first speaker, Gerhard Friederich of Haverford, sketched the rapid development of the Advanced Placement program to its present position of nationwide prominence as a means of training, testing, and accrediting superior students. He stressed as the most significant result of the program the opportunities for school and college representatives to discuss their aims and methods and thus not only to advance the able student more rapidly but to coordinate school and college English generally. After summarizing some concrete gains already made, he posed some questions now confronting us which may involve radical changes in the whole concept of school and college English.

So far, Mr. Friedrich stated, school and college representatives have reached an agreement as to the essential aims of the college freshman course in composition and literature regardless of the different approaches taken. They have made out together essay-type examinations for end-of-the-freshman-year achievement and have graded them, as directed by the Acorn book, with regard to "substance, organization, logic, precision and fluency of style, and proficiency in mechanics" with what constitutes some approach to a national standard. Furthermore the AP courses have improved so much with the teaching experience of the past few

years that there is now a conviction that a much higher proportion of secondary school students can profit by such courses and that college courses in their turn will have to be reconsidered. At least it seems clear that the basic college English course should no longer be considered remedial in any sense of the word but that it should have its own vitality and integrity, whether it is presented as a history of the language, a study of literary types, a course in great books, or in some other form.

Edward T. Wilcox, Director of Advanced Placement at Harvard, followed with a militant talk in which he challenged colleges to define their aims, recognize students who have fulfilled those aims, and permit them to work at the level for which they have proved qualified. Now is the time for colleges to formulate their policies and to show wise flexibility in administrative decisions so that the earnest efforts of the secondary schools may be rightly focused and properly rewarded. This demand involves no lowering of standards, rather a clarification which will enable the secondary schools to give better preparation and the colleges to concentrate on a higher quality of work. "The special genius of the AP program," Mr. Wilcox said, "is that it encourages secondary education to meet a standard, and then recognizes that that standard has been met."

As to procedure, Mr. Wilcox advised colleges not to consider AP candidates in terms of exemption, since college instructors will always in the light of their enthusiasm find that there is some valu-

able residue in their courses. Rather colleges should judge the competence acquired in a substantially equivalent course, which has fitted the superior student to enter a sophomore course.

Mr. Blackburn next described the Honors English program at Washington State College as a typical experiment arising within the particular conditions of one institution for dealing effectively with its superior students. About 5% of the entering class is selected on the basis of ACE and English placement scores, and a special corps of teachers decides upon the general approach and discusses progress frequently. Instructors are given considerable freedom as to texts; but the policy is to read complete books rather than excerpts and to analyze ideas in a variety of fields—philosophy, literature, science, etc. Little time is spent on mechanics in the belief that most students do not need much help and that those “who have resisted years of teaching must now learn for themselves the connections that exist between the idea and its expression.” Papers based on extensive reading afford liberal practice in documentation, and classes have proved stimulating in the calibre of ideas dealt with and in the meeting of able student minds.

As the success of this experiment led the department to believe that other students would be ready for such a course in the second semester, unselected freshmen are now being taught by the Honors method. If this experiment also succeeds, the entire freshman course may be remodeled on the plan of the Honors sections—that is, students will be expected to develop their writing ability as they wrestle with difficult ideas. Obviously, Mr. Blackburn concluded, “a program ‘for the superior student’ cannot be confined. Ideas leak out in all directions; new evaluations of ancient practices spring up; and the teaching of English for all students improves.”

Albert R. Kitzhaber of the University of Kansas concluded the program with a twofold caveat. He warned us not to lose sight of our responsibility to the great majority of the students and also to maintain certain safeguards in the courses for the abler students. The leaders of the past have not always come from the top segment, and in any case “leaders can lead more effectively if they have at least some educated followers.” Even though it may be necessary as the years proceed to refuse a higher percentage of college applicants, Mr. Kitzhaber believes it would be detrimental to our democratic society to refuse a large and influential part of our young people the opportunity of a higher education.

As for the superior students, they should not be allowed to consider themselves “a breed apart” but should have their special responsibilities impressed upon them. To enforce these warnings Mr. Kitzhaber referred to incidents in recent history demonstrating the menace both of large uneducated groups and of a highly educated but irresponsible elite.

In the ensuing discussion there was some consideration of the preferability of awarding advanced placement or offering honors courses. Mr. Wilcox defended the former, since the AP program is in a position to set up criteria from which we can all profit. A high school cannot afford to gear its courses to the expectations of a single college, whereas the AP program defines the common objectives of all the colleges.

There was also some discussion of the extent to which colleges are now giving advanced placement and credit. Mr. Friedrich commented that the AP Commission is working to set up a nationally acceptable system of testing but that it is always the prerogative of the individual college or in some cases of individual departments to determine whether

credit should be given. Mr. Wilcox expressed his opinion that the program is meaningless unless credit is given and pointed to the opportunities thus offered the able student of increasing the number of advanced courses, of undertaking more independent study, and even in many cases of making possible educa-

tion beyond the B.A.

Chairman: Charles E. Blackburn, Washington State College, Pullman, Washington

Speakers: Gerhard Friedrich, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

Edward T. Wilcox, Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Albert R. Kitzhaber, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Recorder: Gertrude E. Noyes, Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut

III. *How Do We Form Our Attitudes Toward News Reporting?*

The panel took the position that most English and communication teachers severely criticize news reporters without knowing much about their process. Bernard Jenson discussed how teachers' attitudes are formed, Kenneth Macrorie cited the reasons for the criticism of news reporting, and Joe Michaels held that objectivity and responsibility are the key problems in the area of news reporting.

Because of a room conflict attendance did not exceed 25.

Mr. Jenson contended that the attitude of teachers towards news reporting generally is a negative one. He pointed out the contextual circles in which our attitudes have grown and are nurtured.

The outer ring is the *distrust of languages*. A suspicion that language does not do what it is supposed to do particularly affects newspapers and news reporting. Add to this the development in physical sciences: the increase in non-linguistic symbols of science, the divergence of these symbols from natural language and the difficulty of communicating their meaning in ordinary language. As our respect for scientists and the language of science grows, our respect for our own poor efforts at communication declines.

The second contextual circle is composed of the *disciplines and the books* which are a part and result of the prevailing distrust of language. He cited such works as Ogden and Richards' *The Meaning of Meaning*, Korzybski's *Science*

and *Sanity* and the development of a whole school of thought and language. In addition, anthropology has turned its attention to living communication systems, and much of the work of psychologists is centered upon the power of language to move people to thought and action. The climate the disciplines have created has resulted in attitudes towards news reporting which, by its nature, touches on the areas of concern of all of them—attitudes which, right or wrong, are for the most part negative and suspicious.

A third context is the newspaper's inevitable inclusion as *mass communication*. Newspapers have lost respect and prestige by being lumped with television, radio, motion pictures, and magazines. Whenever the "danger signal" has gone up about mass media, it has gone up as well for newspapers and news broadcasters.

Where newspapers have been considered primarily as sources of information, mass media are now pretty much widely considered primarily as sources of profit. Advertising, maximum audience, competition for attention and space all became important factors in the evaluation of news reports. Mass media have affected—in many cases actually formed—our attitude towards that very small part of media activity called news reporting.

These three areas—distrust of language, the reading of our era, and the fear of mass media—form the context of

our attitudes towards news reporting. Interspersed throughout of course is our experience with news reporting: inaccuracy, distortion, bias, unfairness, imbalance.

* * *

Mr. Macrorie expressed concern for the exaggerated attacks responsible scholars have made on the press and explored the reasons for these attacks. One reason is that news reporting for many years has been studied in the context of propaganda. Another is that criticism since World War II has been largely negative; that is, critics have made a study of bias, not of responsibility. Still another characteristic of the criticism of news reporting is that its target has almost always been Republican or conservative publications and communicators.

Mr. Macrorie reported on a series of first-hand studies he made of conscientious, responsible newsmen and how they faced problems of fairness and objectivity in their actual day-to-day process. He illustrated with the reporter who leans over backwards in an effort to be fair to a person he knows he is prejudiced against, the reporter who resists the pressure from an advertiser, and the reporter whose work is affected by limitations of space and time. The examples emphasized that critics of news reporting have not looked inside the news process at real men in action, that investigations of reporting have not been made in a scholarly, fair manner.

* * *

Mr. Michaels pointed out that broadcast news was not born, it just sort of happened. Persons involved in transmitting the news by radio and television are still learning, for the broadcast of news by voice goes back only about three decades and by voice and picture, only one. The development of new techniques with the vast range of picture possibilities and the public reaction to those techniques points up that the broadcasting of tele-

vision news presents reporters with rare opportunities, but with problems, too.

Not the least of these problems are objectivity and responsibility. The temptation to editorialize, to be subjective, is great in television today. Slanting of the news is so easy to do, and it can be done so subtly. Surprisingly the broadcaster may be unaware of his doing it, as Mr. Michaels revealed in his own case.

With pictures and sound a reporter can influence people's emotions with almost alarming ease. Add movies involving real people and real events and the power is great—for television is in the home and it is on hour after hour.

Mr. Michaels demonstrated with film clips the emotional impact that television can engender. A film dealing with recent riots by Fascist elements in Italy had no sound but even without voices and background music, the film was much more emotionally charged than a written news account.

Television reporting offers many opportunities for the unscrupulous. Sometimes it is not fair to show everything, even if a true picture, because all of the story is not before the camera. Mr. Michaels cited the integration flareups in Nashville; most citizens went about their business as usual and only a few persons caused the difficulties. Since time did not allow responsible reporters to show the best of the city, it was unfair to show the worst.

There are times when a television reporter must delete film because of the emotional wallop it may have. Mr. Michaels illustrated with filmed interviews growing out of the Ku Klux Klan-Indian incidents last fall in North Carolina. The film showed a portion of an interview with an Indian spokesman which was deleted because of a provocative statement which could have been responsible for bloodshed. But Mr. Michaels emphasized that a delicate situation should

not be
mate
must g
Tele
edged
convinc
er is t
nor to
vision
tight-r
ganda

"I a
is wh
gradu
compo
for the
gradu
first s
fore t
tion:
dents
men c
altern

One
drasti
studen
is "ac
have
use of
which
fresh
langu
when
a vex
(Sha

Bu
assist
er of
depar
high
diana
perce
(Wil
Sir
ants

not be ducked; if it constitutes a legitimate and integral part of the story it must go in no matter what the impact.

Television news broadcasting is a two-edged sword—the greater the power to convince, the more conscious the reporter is that his job is neither to convince nor to convert, but to inform. The television reporter walks a gossamer-thin tight-rope between the Scylla of propaganda on the one hand and the Charyb-

dis of dullness on the other.

If an informed public is one of the goals of democracy, the role of television in the future will be a vital one.

Participating Chairman: Kenneth Macrorie, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Speakers: Bernard A. Jenson, New York State Teachers College, Buffalo

Joe Michaels, Roving News Reporter for the Dave Garroway Show Today, NBC

Recorder: Craig Swauger, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania

IV. *The Role of the Graduate Assistant as Instructor in English*

"I assume that the question before us is whether or not the employment of graduate students to teach freshman composition is a good idea—a good idea for the freshmen and a good idea for the graduate students." (Shaaber) Thus the first speaker put the central question before the panel. Implied is another question: if the employment of graduate students is *not* good for either the freshmen or the graduate himself, what is the alternative?

One alternative might evolve from a drastic change in the policy for admitting students to colleges and universities. It is "admitting only those students who have already attained proficiency in the use of language equal at least to that to which we award a passing grade in freshman composition." (Shaaber) Good language habits are most easily learned when young. "Freshman composition is a vexation because it comes too late." (Shaaber)

But what is the role of the graduate assistant? He is or is becoming the *teacher* of composition and for many he is the department of English. "Of the 2281 high school students who came to Indiana this fall [1957], 2105, or over 92 percent, were taught by assistants." (Wikelund)

Since the majority of graduate assistants are inexperienced teachers, there is

real need for guidance. There is little carry-over between literature courses studied and composition courses taught. Much of the graduate's first teaching year must be spent, therefore, trying to keep "a step or two ahead of our students in the technical points of grammar." (McCrosson)¹ The assistant needs a clearly defined syllabus and an opportunity to discuss specific problems of teaching, such as how to discuss a reading assignment. On the other hand he is "reluctant to accept, and perhaps [is] repelled by, any conscious attempt" to be taught to become a teacher. (McCrosson). He wants standards. He wants a library of reference materials and model themes. To help the new assistant we require his taking a "two-hour course . . . during the first semester of his service with us. In it we take up specific problems connected with the syllabus as they occur in the schedule, as well as general methods of teaching and the myriad miscellaneous questions that always arise." (Wikelund)

Concerning visits by senior members to classes of the graduate assistant: "If visitations are inevitable, we think that it should be admitted that they are conducted largely as departmental checks on the performance of the graduate assist-

¹Miss McCrosson's paper was printed in full in *College Composition and Communication*, May, 1958.

ant . . . it is no help at all later to be told that he should develop a more relaxed atmosphere in the classroom . . . especially if he realizes that long before the visit he had successfully overcome any manifestation of nervousness." (McCros-son). On the other hand, "as much to give him confidence as to correct his faults and insure standards . . . we visit his classes and confer with him informally." (Wikelund)

But of what value is the teaching experience to freshmen and assistant? For freshmen the assistant has "a sense of excitement, zest, and enthusiasm in their work." The assistant with help can be a better teacher than a senior member. It is probably true that most assistants neglect their studies to devote more time to their teaching. "Teaching is obviously of the utmost importance to him as training for his profession . . . for the superstition still prevails in our graduate schools that counting the French words in the English text of the *Ancren riwe* . . . is all the preparation necessary for facing a class of restless boys and girls . . ." (Shaabber)

Concerning the departmental isolation of the graduate assistant: "The intellectual stimulation, the professional enrichment and encouragement, the feeling of recognition and belonging which they could gain from association with older colleagues are denied them." (Wikelund). And from an assistant, "But more than anything else, we need to know that if we founder, someone will gladly help us . . . If there is mutual respect and a reasonable amount of courtesy displayed on both sides, there is no reason to believe that the relationship between the

junior and senior staffs will not be mutually pleasant and rewarding." (McCros-son).

During the discussion period: Does the system of employing assistants furnish cheap instruction? Probably not if the assistant teaches two sections. It does, however, create an inducement for new Ph.D's to join the senior faculty where they will not teach freshman composition. Why should the teaching of freshman composition be considered sub-standard professionally when skill in communication is one skill that *all* college graduates will need and use? But if the teaching of communication is emphasized, does this make of its English department a trade school? A possible sign of a trend was the question, Would teaching experience by English majors in their junior and senior years help them as graduate assistants? Perhaps more help would be the offering of graduate courses in language and rhetoric, history of the language and semantics. In the closing moments came the following: The teaching of literature and the belief that some day one will become a great scholar has become an obsession. Yet how much original work is published? How much research in writing is done? And finally: There is no high correlation between good teaching and longevity. Approximately 60 attended.

Chairman: Francis Christensen, University of Southern California

Speaker: M. A. Shaaber, University of Pennsylvania (Department Chairman), Philadelphia
Philip Wikelund, Indiana University (Director of Composition), Bloomington

Doris R. McCros-son, University of Pennsylvania (Graduate Assistant)

Recorder: J. Stanley Cook, Pennsylvania State University, University Park

V. National Standards and Accreditation For Composition and Communication Courses

This panel was planned by the Interim Committee on National Standards in Composition and Communication, with Edgar Whan of Ohio University as chair-

man, to determine the reaction of teachers of college composition and communication to the formulation of national standards of accreditation and the estab-

lishment of an agency for evaluating English departments on the basis of these standards.

A. J. Sachs of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute began the panel discussions by presenting some of the problems involved in setting up national standards. He focused attention on the problem of growing enrollments, warning the group that classes should not grow so large as to decrease the number of assigned themes. "Composition is the basis of Freshman English," he said, "and it should emphasize much writing and speaking." He pointed up the fact that the enrollment in composition is usually the largest on any campus and that this enrollment, which is concentrated in the freshman and sophomore years, ranges from more than fifty percent to ninety percent of the entire student population. In spite of this fact, Mr. Sachs discouraged the use of student assistants in grading themes and was skeptical about the use of TV as a means of solving the problem of increasing enrollments. He declared that composition cannot be taught effectively over TV, since it deprives the student of that development which he receives from questions, arguments, and discussions of controversial issues. Ideally, it should be taught in small classes, for it encourages the student to think logically and develops his interest in literature and the problems of our times.

Mr. Sachs deplored the tendency of giving low professional rank and low pay for teachers of freshman and sophomore English, of allocating, as office space for English teachers, cast-off rooms with cast-off furniture or with little equipment and few supplies.

Donald R. Tuttle, Fenn College, spoke on the subject "What Specific Goals and Standards Can We Realistically Affirm Touching Both the Teaching Program and the Staff?" Emphasizing first the difficulty of formulating answers to the question assigned to him,

Mr. Tuttle proceeded to divide the problems and to suggest possible ways of dealing with them. He called attention first of all to the need for a well-prepared and dedicated teacher. "The good teacher," he said, "should be able to plan the course and to define its objectives; to find effective teaching methods; and proper texts and other materials; and to evaluate the results of his teaching."

After discussing the qualifications of a good teacher, Mr. Tuttle proposed the following teaching conditions as necessary for the maintenance of standards: (1) academic matters such as the curriculum, textbooks, course requirements, and standards for promotion should be controlled by the teaching faculty; (2) teachers of composition and communication should be able to attain the highest professional rank; (3) the chairman of the English department should have the power to recommend appointments of teachers to the administrative heads of the institution; (4) the teacher should have a reasonable load. A reasonable load he defined as that proposed by NCTE in 1957.

As to the content of composition classes, Mr. Tuttle felt that the collegiate program should deal not with skills, but with ideas and principles; with the development of style and power in expression; and with critical reading. He insisted that the college should work with the secondary school in matters pertaining to improved certification requirements, the teaching program, and college entrance requirements. Concerning the passing of the standardized test as a requirement for admission, Mr. Tuttle presented arguments pro and con, describing the use of such tests at several institutions and urging the necessity of developing a national standard for the grading of themes.

Though referring to his address as an exploration rather than a concrete set of

proposals, Mr. Tuttle made it clear that respectable standards should be required of the student, the teaching program, and of the teaching staff.

The question assigned to Edgar Whan of Ohio University was "How may we best affirm and implement standards once we have set them?" As Chairman of the Interim Committee on National Standards and Accreditation, he spent some time reviewing the work of the committee since May, 1957. According to the answers to a questionnaire compiled by the committee and sent to college English departments, there is a general feeling among instructors that something can and should be done to formulate national standards and to establish an agency for evaluating individual departments and colleges. Many of the answers to the questionnaire revealed that teachers are deeply concerned about matters of teacher preparation, class size, and the number of words required in a theme.

Mr. Whan concluded his remarks with the recommendation that the work of the Interim Committee be expanded by a permanent committee and that this committee concern itself with the following matters: (1) compile a list of the chairmen of English departments; (2) draft a questionnaire; (3) make a list of needed standards; (4) draft a proposal for the establishment of an accrediting commission. Referring to problems involved in setting up an accrediting agency, he implied that he would resort to pressure when needed.

The major issues to be resolved in setting up an accrediting agency were cited by William Selden, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting. Mr. Selden advised that the members of such an agency should have a broad point of view; that issues should be resolved on a national scheme; that

broad, well-developed curricula must be insisted upon; that institutions to be accredited will have to report to the Commission; that requirements must be set up for accrediting. He questioned the relationship between office equipment and teacher effectiveness. Any program of accreditation, he emphasized, should be designed to improve the lot of the student.

When questioned, Mr. Selden warned that CCCC might be discouraged because administrators may not recognize its power. Asked why certain areas of specialization have accrediting powers, Mr. Selden noted that chemistry and psychology have such powers. He stated that colleges could not prevent chemistry from its accrediting powers because the field of chemistry is too powerful. Cecil Blue of Lincoln University in Missouri asked the question, "How did the National Association of Schools of Music get recognition?" "It is an old organization," Mr. Selden explained; "therefore it is a pressure group. English composition," he continued, "lacks the force, the pressure, and the organization of these areas." When Mr. Whan asked whether there should be a person on the accrediting agency to cope with the problems confronting composition and communication courses, Mr. Selden stressed the administrative problems involved in setting up an accrediting agency and commented upon the effect of accreditation on the languages and other areas of education. All in all, his remarks were a plea for careful analysis before the establishment of an accrediting agency.

The reaction of the fifty-three persons assembled for this fifth panel discussion left no doubt in the minds of the committee that the matter of standards and accreditation is one of deep concern for instructors who are charged with the task of improving the quality of writing and

speaking
them

1Mr.
College
1958

John
opened
for the
fresh
time
based
fault
about
in our
moral
course
our s
ing c
must
not v
of th
be fo
and

Mr.
six a
pres
the
imit
ing
expe
only
writ
este
con
con
ever
stud
from
that
app
can
cau
him
enc
me

speaking of the students who come to them.¹

¹Mr. Tuttle's paper was printed in full in *College Composition and Communication*, May, 1958

Chairman: John Hicks, Stetson University, DeLand, Florida

Speakers: Edgar W. Whan, Ohio University, Athens

Donald R. Tuttle, Fenn College, Cleveland, Ohio
H. J. Sachs, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston

Recorder: Lorena Kemp, West Virginia State College, Institute

VI. *The Study of Standard Literature in the Freshman Course*

John Finch of Dartmouth College opened the panel discussion with a plea for the reading of great literature in the freshman course. Contending that the time had come for high-mindedness, he based his plea on moral grounds. The fault with much of our recent thinking about freshman writing, he argued, lies in our signal failure to remember the moral relationship which exists between ourselves and the language which forms our subject. In a time when we are being offered idols of inarticulateness, we must assert that the inarticulate life is not worth living. The central revelation of the highest kind of articulation is to be found in the great imaginative writers, and on their productions rests our hope.

Mr. Finch proceeded to challenge the six assumptions on which he contended present writing courses are based: (1) the best way to teach writing is by the imitation of models; (2) the best writing is writing out of the student's raw experience; (3) the student should write only about what he knows; (4) he should write only about himself; (5) he is interested only in current affairs; (6) our concern must be with form instead of content. The aim of the teacher, however, is not to elicit the flimsy ideas the student already has; rather it is to confront the student with ideas so pressing that they demand their own clear and appropriate articulation. The student cannot write about himself simply because he doesn't know enough about himself and because he has not had enough experience to write about. By meeting the dramatization of ideas as ex-

perienced in our greatest literature, he will find his own forms of expressing his response.

Moving to particulars, Mr. Finch suggested specific topics which might emerge after a study of *Hamlet* (e.g., Why did not Gertrude see the ghost?), topics which would prove more interesting to all concerned than such a conventional subject as "My Summer's Experience." Besides being more interesting, the themes emerging from the study of masterpieces would be better written, since the student would be responding to an image of experience in which the primal values of life achieve their highest verbal expression. Surely we owe the students and ourselves the very best we have—the great writers. If we give the best we may find, Mr. Finch concluded, "that we are turning out neither salesmen nor assistants in a shop, but true clerks, persons who can read and write."

Mr. Eugene Grewe of the University of Detroit, the next speaker, focused his attention upon a two-year course of writing in which both expository prose and literature would provide the basic subject matter. The basic subject matter for a freshman writing course must inevitably be, Mr. Grewe felt, expository writing. From a graphic analysis of the various literary genres, copies of which he distributed to the audience, Mr. Grewe charted the distinguishing features of lyric poetry at the one extreme as opposed to scientific writing at the other. The chief trait of the lyric—as well as of imaginative writing in general—is that it pleases. It aims through connota-

tive and figurative language along indirect and imaginative lines toward personal, subjective truth. Scientific writing, as well as expository writing in general, is primarily didactic. It strives to teach by employing denotative and literal language to describe impersonal, objective truth.

Although the majority of English teachers much prefer to teach literature and balk at the more rigorous and seemingly less interesting expository essay, the best method of equipping a student to meet the demands of writing which we ourselves expect of him still remains in employing those forms of writing bordering on the scientific. Even Brooks and Warren, who pioneered in the study of poetry, recognized, as their textbooks abundantly prove, that exposition demands a wholly different approach, different subject matter, and different skills. We will do well to recognize that, although we may enjoy teaching literature more, there is no strength through joy in the teaching of composition. Any strength we may achieve lies in revealing to the student the discipline which exposition demands, and we can discover that discipline only through a study of the forms which exhibit it most clearly, the forms which constitute the realm of expository prose.

Mr. Grewe felt that the lack of joy so abundantly evident in the attitude with which the teacher confronts a course in composition and communication arises not so much from a built-in reaction on the part of the teacher as from the unfortunate status given composition courses by departments administering them. Unless we come to see composition as a valid and integral part of the curriculum, and not as a punishment doled out to victims who, because of youth or the lack of a degree, are forced to serve on this "lower" level, we shall never really emerge to any great degree triumphant from our encounter with the freshmen.

Mr. Edward Stone of Ohio University, the final speaker on the panel, discussed the kinds of literature which should be retained in a freshman course by directing his main attention to the great books which profitably could be removed. *Hamlet*, *Gulliver's Travels*, Dante's *Inferno*, *Moby Dick*, and *The Scarlet Letter* he felt must go. The student at seventeen is incapable of grasping the reach of the great diabolists, and sits in stunned confusion as their words go far over his head. The instructor may revel in the shock power of these masterpieces, but if he does he either engages in unfortunate misinterpretations or in fuzzy wishful thinking. These great books may reach us when we are thirty-five, but they are wasted on the freshmen, and unless English departments grasp the precise reality of the freshman mind, we shall continue with unavailing efforts to rehearse the great epiphanies before minds incapable of recognizing or realizing the most minimal vision. The fundamental bases of *The Inferno* and *Paradise Lost* are already usually omitted from anthologies containing portions of these works; thus we look in vain for Dante's Canto XI or Milton's all-explaining God in Book III of *Paradise Lost*.

Mr. Stone did not, however, advocate throwing out *all* the great literature. *Romeo and Juliet*, *Macbeth*, *A Modest Proposal*, *The House of the Seven Gables*—such works as these might remain. But from the *Paradise* of the Very Great Masters we must exclude the freshman.

About eighty people attended the panel discussion.

Participating Chairman: John Finch, Dartmouth College

Speakers: Edward Stone, Ohio University, Athens

Eugene Grewe, University of Detroit

Recorder: James M. Cox, Indiana University, Bloomington

VII. Proficiency Beyond the Freshman Year

Catherine Bullard of Central Washington College of Education reported on their plan, now one year old, of spreading attention to English composition over the freshman, sophomore, and junior years. Under the plan a student will do one quarter of composition work in each of his first three college years, with students scheduled into the courses in each quarter so that the load of composition instructors is spread evenly over the academic year. Miss Bullard stated that the plan was based on three assumptions: that basic to effective communication the (1) individual must have something to say, (2) must be given a valid reason for saying it, and (3) must have the technical equipment for saying it effectively. Most freshmen, she said, have something to say—but not much; and this plan will prolong the composition work into the period when the student may be presumed to have more to say. And, by continuing the active writing process through the upper years, the Central Washington plan hopes to prevent much of the writing being done “in a vacuum”—i.e., meaningless assignments, cooked-up for the standard freshman course.

The freshman quarter's work will involve short pieces of exposition, and concentration on effective paragraphing, grammar, usage, and mechanics. In the sophomore quarter emphasis will be on more sophisticated organization, logic, outlining, and the analysis of expository selections. In the junior year the student will produce a documented paper of some length, plus additional shorter pieces of informal argument, narration, and description. By agreement, all departments at Central Washington now require no documented papers of students prior to this junior year training.

In summary, Miss Bullard stated: “We believe that spreading the training in composition over a longer period of time

will make it possible for students to learn to write in situations which present these conditions to a considerably greater degree than is the case when all of the formal training in composition is in the first year of college work.”

Thaddeus Seymour, director of the Writing Clinic at Dartmouth College, next described the operation there. A Dartmouth student reported to the Writing Clinic

must continue attendance until he has remedied his deficiencies. In the case of students who fail to attend the Clinic or fail to satisfy its requirements, the Committee on Student English will recommend to the Executive Committee of the Faculty that their degrees be withheld.

Two Dartmouth faculty members staff the Clinic, Mr. Seymour devoting two-thirds of his time to it, another man one-third of his. Together, these gentlemen conduct fourteen Clinic hours each week, and each student committed to the Clinic is required to attend regularly one of these classes.

The ETS Cooperative English Test on the Mechanics of Expression is given first, and any man who scores in the top third of the national percentile is exempted from Clinic attendance. (Mr. Seymour defended the use of such an objective test against all comers, saying that he shared “apprehensions about such examinations as a measure of ability” but “was confident that they do reliably measure disability.”)

Students who fail to pass the placement examination master a spelling test based on a five-hundred-word list, and write a satisfactory one-hour essay.

Mr. Seymour's contention was that the main problem in maintaining standards beyond the freshman year is “simply the backsliding of most students because they assume that the standards of Fresh-

man English are not required in history, sociology, language, or science. Thus they write first for quantity, second for content, and finally (and rarely) for correct and effective expression." And, he went on, "Clinic classes . . . provide the remedy for students whose writing clearly needs remedial treatment but . . . also provides the necessary . . . kick in the pants. . . ."

Mr. Duncan E. Mallam, chairman of the panel, next discussed the situation at Iowa State College under the title "Bulwarks against Backsliding." Starting with the premise that "before you can maintain proficiency you have to establish it," he described how, at Iowa State, with a freshman class of 2500 each year they test the aptitude, reading ability, and mechanical competence of each student, assigning him to an appropriate freshman-level course. Failure at this level necessitates repetition of the most basic course "again and again" until minimum standards are met.

For students above the freshman rank, Iowa State College maintains a daily writing clinic which students may use *voluntarily*, though Mr. Mallam reported that faculty members are instrumental in prodding students into submission to clinic discipline.

The bulk of Mr. Mallam's statement had to do with the test for composition proficiency given to seniors and entering graduate students at Iowa State College—a 500-word impromptu expository paper written within a period of two hours. This is given five times each year, and failure means automatic referral to the writing clinic, where the student prepares himself for the test again when next it is given. Here "he writes papers for practice, and brings them to the clinic ord of what the student does, so that the assistance given him by various clinicians for criticism. The clinician keeps a rec-

can be co-ordinated. If the student needs an inordinant amount of attention, he is expected to hire a tutor."

Students are not permitted to take the examination other than at stated times, so a student who fails it during the quarter of his expected graduation is in a bad predicament.

The graduate school uses the proficiency examination as one screening device, among others, for the elimination of students incapable of pursuing a graduate program to the end. To avoid being dropped, a graduate student must pass the test on his second attempt.

This program, Mr. Mallam explained, has been in use since 1941 and, though there are objections voiced to it by students—reports of cheating, unfairness in the reading of papers, etc.—Iowa State College plans to hold to it as a useful device to prevent backsliding and to prevent the hopelessly illiterate from getting degrees.

The consensus of the panel might be put in the words of Mr. Seymour: ". . . it is in the lonely editorial process that men learn to write—not in the classroom and not in writing clinics." But classes and writing clinics help. And the constant note of regret that sounded through the discussion was that other departments will not be as zealous as English departments are in maintaining writing standards. Indeed, the session closed with a lady asking: "What about illiterate faculty members who couldn't possibly judge student writing?"

She received no answer.

Participating Chairman: Duncan E. Mallam, Iowa State College, Ames

Speakers: Thaddeus Seymour, Dartmouth College
Catharine Bullard, Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg

Recorder: Richard Stonesifer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

VIII. *Experiments in Teaching Composition and Communication*

The students participating in the two experiments reported by Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago, were all in remedial sections of Freshman English. The aim of both efforts was to ascertain as well as possible the relative effectiveness of the structural and non-structural (traditional) approaches to grammar as a basis for instruction. It was the opinion of Mr. Johnson that the battery of five variegated tests showed no significant difference in results achieved, showing the structural approach to be at least as desirable as the other but not demonstrably better. A mimeographed statement, distributed to the 100 members of the audience, "A Gentle Dissent," written by Andrew Schiller, one of the three men performing the experiment, was dedicated to the "feeling" that, ignoring tests and statistics, the structural approach is "far, far better than any we have tried before."

The material presented by William D. Baker, New York State Teachers College, Buffalo, is scheduled for appearance in *College English*. The essence of his method is to stimulate the student to analyze the successes of other writers and to adopt useful techniques for their own purposes. The device used for helping the student focus his attention on the analysis is a notebook which makes for greater concentration of idea and necessity for expression and fulfillment therefrom. The notebook is kept in addition to the regular papers thought of as customarily written in Freshman English courses. The speaker presented a variety of devices or "approaches" related to his tactics.

The theory that rhetorical principles form a harmony between core principles of western civilization and linguistic structure was the basis for a discussion by Joseph A. Rogers of St. Louis University. He explained his view that the harmony can be exploited to help the student write better. Seeing the Greek civilization as realistic and in a western tradition of specificity, he voiced his belief that study of concrete writing in Greek classics conditions the student to write in a definite, accurate way. The "western commitment to reality" was seen by Mr. Rogers as opposed to "Oriental Abstraction."

The participating chairman, Harry H. Crosby, State University of Iowa, described an experiment still in progress at his school. The Ford Foundation's money (\$26,000) has been matched by University funds to produce a series of 28 films designed to incorporate the best possible presentations of basic communication prepared through cooperative effort of all staff members. Now the staff will try to decide what may be learned from results achieved in comparable classes taught in the "regular" way, using the films, and in a program under which students are given a bibliography and asked to dig out what they need to know through independent study.

Participating Chairman: Harry H. Crosby, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Speakers: Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
William D. Baker, New York State Teachers College, Buffalo

Joseph A. Rogers, St. Louis University

Recorder: William Sutton, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

IX. *Relevance of American Studies to the Composition-Communication Course*

The panel discussion jointly sponsored by CCCC and the American Studies Association on "The Relevance of American Studies to the Composition/Communication

Course" attracted the attendance of about 80 persons. Chaired by Erwin Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology, the discussion offered three lines of

approach to the problem set.

The first panelist, Edward F. Grier, University of Kansas, basing his remarks on the survey he has recently completed of American Studies programs in American colleges and universities, went to the heart of the matter by suggesting that one of the principal problems of freshman courses is finding something for students to write about, and that American Studies materials can at least be used for library problems and research papers. But he urged caution in elaborating more ambitious programs on the freshman level. Specifically, he pointed out that it is probably not wise to limit the freshman's cultural experience to his own country. He suggested, too, that demands on the teacher's knowledge are such that graduate assistants who teach many freshman courses ought not to have additional burdens placed on them, and that most students should not undertake such studies without preliminary training in history. And he remarked that since American Studies is still searching for ways to become a discipline, it is not yet as appropriate for freshmen as for graduate students. Finally, he averred, it is the business of English departments to teach literature; the freshman course cannot do everything, and it should limit itself to what it can do well.

Warren G. French, Stetson University, the second panelist, assumed the utility of American Studies in the freshman course and went directly to a demonstration of one way to embody such material, via the route of popular culture. He observed that Americans tend to split into two unequal groups regarding the arts—the Byzantines and the Visigoths—and that in the freshman composition class the two groups are bound to meet. A Byzantine teacher faces overwhelming odds against success if he merely exhorts his Visigoth charges to repent their ways. But if they are met on a ground common to all, in a study of the popular

culture we are all immersed in, there is hope of moving from the more humble arts to the elite, both of America and the rest of the world. Specifically, he suggested that the early stages of a freshman course be devoted to an analytical exploration of American culture as a means of forming critical judgment useful later in the course in studying more complex art.

Pointing out that the advertising arts make use of the same techniques as the serious poets, painters, and composers, Mr. French gave a demonstration of how readily-available advertising material can be analyzed to establish knowledge of some of these techniques, at the same time sharpen critical understanding of what any art has to offer, as well as give insight into the motives and morals of the advertiser. Using advertisements of automobiles, he explained how the artists achieved the effects they had aimed at by methods parallel to those El Greco used in "Christ on the Cross." It was immediately evident that each artist had a message; and it was equally evident which message was more honest, and which was more important. The Edsel ad, coming from the student's own area of experience, was shown to be an approach to the El Greco painting. Before we can ask a student to explore the complexities of a Shakespearean sonnet, it seems reasonable, Mr. French suggested, to ask him to think critically about a popular song.

The Byzantine failure is complacent self-satisfaction with the culture the Byzantines know; but popular culture is equally satisfying to the Visigoths. When students begin to feel a need for something more than superficial arts, this plan of instruction will provide the knowledge of where to find it. Mr. French ended by asserting that American Studies is relevant to the freshman course because it provides materials for exploring our immediate environment,

which hope to

The Univer problem by com ties, f man c ties ca jects i im tha living use of choice used already the m and groun manit tion v rante edge manis

Tal ed pl of ha porar about manis Mr. C ues in stude and l good arts. much is als to re and

Th A M Fresi Coun prox

which we must understand before we can hope to understand another.

The final panelist, Patrick D. Hazard, University of Pennsylvania, carried the problem to a higher level of abstraction by considering the place of the humanities, functionally defined, in the freshman course. He insisted that the humanities can be the most "practical" of subjects if we remember the Socratic maxim that the unexamined life is not worth living, and put humanistic values to the use of clarifying such moral and aesthetic choices as are available to us. He, too, used popular American culture, an area already hazily known to the student, as the means of learning to make moral and aesthetic choices on humanistic grounds. Too often, he declared, the humanities suffer from humanists' infatuation with the past, and from their unwarranted assumption that areas of knowledge like the social sciences have no humanistic contributions to make.

Taking from our ideology the cherished phrase "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," he analyzed its contemporary context to show what questions about moral and aesthetic choices a humanist should ask with his students. Like Mr. Grier, he believes the humanistic values implicit in American Studies can give students something worth writing about; and like Mr. French, he suggested that a good place to start is with the popular arts. He emphasized that while there is much that is shoddy in popular arts, there is also much that is good; for the student to remain ignorant of the best being said and done in the arts, on whatever level,

is for him to be deprived of the most vital experience available in his society. An adequate approach to the humanities in America must provide the framework for a thorough and comprehensive examination of the state of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the student's own society. The means for such an examination are increasingly available as the result of scholarship in interdisciplinary American Studies; the material presently accessible is sufficient to make possible that examination of the student's own life which has been the hallmark of humanism since the time of Socrates.

Mr. Grier came back to offer brief remarks as a formal rebuttal, saying that he was in fundamental agreement with Messrs. French and Hazard but urging that there is ever the problem of how much of such a program is practicable under present college conditions. Various questions were raised from the floor, among them a desire for clarification of the place of American music in such a program, and for further information on techniques of developing the critical apparatus needed in such a course. The panelists cordially shared their knowledge and experience to the extent allowed by the limits of time.

Chairman: Erwin Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh

Speakers: Patrick D. Hazard, American Studies Association

Warren G. French, Stetson University, DeLand, Florida

Edward F. Grier, University of Kansas, Lawrence

Recorder: Charles Boewe, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

X. A Mutual Appraisal of the College Freshman and High School English Courses

The panel entitled *As Others See Us: A Mutual Appraisal of the College Freshman and High School English Courses* was attended by a group of approximately ninety people. Fred W.

Lorch of Iowa State College served as chairman.

Jules Kritzer, teacher of English from Barringer High School, Newark, New Jersey, presented his views on *The Tradi-*

tional High School English Curriculum Viewpoint. The main points of his address are as follows. Socio-economic changes affect the standards of the secondary school before they are felt in college. Changes made to meet these new conditions are responsible for the lack of pupil ability in reading and writing. Another factor contributing to lack of achievement is the variety of areas to be investigated in the high school English classes: literature, spelling, reading, writing, and grammar.

An evaluation of the "traditionalist" vs. the "functionalist" in the teaching of grammar has produced no solution to the problem of preparing the student who must be sent on to college with a foundation on which something can be built. A more effective liaison between high schools and colleges to establish a better understanding on mutual problems and a more effective means of stimulating the student was then suggested.

The next speaker was E. A. Tenney of Indiana State Teachers College who stated: "My thesis is this: in proportion to our public neglect of the master science of languages and literature is the inferiority of our leadership, great and small." In expanding this idea, Mr. Tenney suggested that much of the apathy and corruption in our leaders is due to sheer ignorance created by the national failure to recognize the necessity for an enlightened leadership. Our century has rejected this prime purpose of public education, first enunciated by Plato, and has substituted "social acceptability," "life-adjustment," and a miscellany of other aims in the name of "mass" education. Modern psychology has discovered no new way for man to express his thoughts. He still depends upon words which are the expression of the highest human power, the power to think.

The statistical method cannot be used as a gauge in determining the extent to which the master science has fallen, but

the number of "illiterates" who graduate from state-supported schools each year is evident testimony to an alarming dearth of literate products. Mr. Tenney maintained that the collegiate situation is but an extension of the high school situation. "The public schools now guarantee the illiteracy of their products." The teacher in a public tax-supported college is then faced with the problem of teaching fundamentals, but it is too late to begin laying the foundations here. In his concluding remarks Mr. Tenney suggested that national leadership would do well to study the problem of his thesis with the same intensity that it appears to be giving to the other sciences.

The third speaker, Mr. Bain Tate Stewart, Associate Professor of English at the University of Tennessee, discussed *Some Characteristics of Successful Programs in High School English*. Examining high school English principally through the performance and statements of his students corroborated by conversation with high school teachers and supervisors of instruction and by occasional visits in the schools, Mr. Stewart suggested four characteristics for a successful high school English program:

1. A consistently applied controlling emphasis upon the general objectives of command over language and understanding of literature would develop an integration of skills instead of a mastery of isolated segments.

2. Appropriate limitation in curriculum would eliminate a variety of activities alien to the basic instructional program from the English class. Balance in the distribution of grammar, language, and literature studies throughout the four years would obviate the lack of attention given to composition during the last two years in many high schools. The diversity in the amount of writing done in high schools elicited the suggestion that "a few papers, carefully written, carefully marked by the instructor, and

careful
student
many
hastily

3. T
ized h
areas
instru
student
pecial
dent
himse
course
has fa
what

4. A
tion v
of th
would
Stewa
need
scien
of a
Th
Lewi
lish t
Phila
when
high
us to
what

J.
Flor
that
remo
has
Hum
plain
dial
labor
it. F
conc
of th
mai
nec
his

carefully corrected and revised by the students are more valuable than a great many papers hastily written and more hastily forgotten."

3. The effective program is characterized by repetition of material with new areas of application so that the level of instruction is appreciably raised as the student advances. This technique is especially important for the superior student who may have difficulty adjusting himself to the requirements of college courses if his high school English course has failed to teach him anything beyond what he learned in grammar school.

4. A pervading philosophy of education which emphasizes the best features of the old and the new approaches would stimulate effective teaching. Mr. Stewart concluded by mentioning the need for intelligent, well-educated conscientious teachers and for recognition of a reasonable pupil load.

The last speaker of the panel, Mr. Lewis Sterner, administrator and English teacher in Frankford High School, Philadelphia, first recalled the old days when the clear-cut battle issues between high school and college were: "You asked us to do too much, and you didn't do what we expected you to do." Mr. Ster-

ner observed that now it is difficult for anyone to arrive at definitions or issues since both high schools and colleges present a picture of planned and organized confusion. The college has the right to expect its prospective freshmen to have some positive, correct, factual knowledge even in composition. The speaker then decried the lowering of standards in high school for the college-bound student. As a college teacher, Mr. Sterner suggested that the college, too, scrutinize its standards and without lowering them, aim at helping, not discouraging, freshmen. The final recommendation was for an understanding between college and high school on a definite body of specific factual material in composition, communication, and literature to be taught in high school and used in college entrance examinations

Chairman: Fred W. Lorch, Iowa State College
Speakers: Jules Kritzer, Barringer High School,
 Newark, New Jersey

E. A. Tenney, Indiana State Teachers College,
 Terre Haute
 Bain Tate Stewart, University of Tennessee,
 Knoxville
 Lewis Sterner, Frankford High School, Philadelphia

Recorder: Sister M. Rita Margaret, O. P., Caldwell College for Women, Caldwell, New Jersey

XI. Remedial English: Luxury or Necessity?

J. Hooper Wise of, the University of Florida, the first speaker, pointed out that the University of Florida got rid of remedial English twenty years ago and has survived successfully. Mr. Robert Hunting of Purdue University then explained how Purdue came to drop remedial English and described the writing laboratory that has been substituted for it. Frank S. Hook of Lehigh University concluded the papers with a description of the situation at Lehigh University. His main point was that remedial English is necessary for him at Lehigh both to give his weaker students what they need and

to enable him to maintain his present high standards in the regular course.

The panel was attended by about 125 persons. Questions and discussion concerned technical procedures of the program presented. Considerable interest centered upon Mr. Hunting's description of the voluntary writing laboratory at Purdue and upon the matter of testing writing skills.

Participating Chairman: Frank S. Hook, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania

Speakers: J. Hooper Wise, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Robert Hunting, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Recorder: Philip Kildahl, Brainerd Junior College, Minnesota

XII. Recent Developments in Teaching Reading

After an introduction by the chairman, Mr. Morton Botel, the three speakers in the reading workshop presented briefly their ideas concerning reading at the college and high school levels.

Miss Theodore's thesis was that learning to read is a continuous process which needs carefully planned, systematic guidance. The particular function of the high school and college in promoting growth in reading is the provision of instruction which will result in increased competence in a student's ability to read with greater depth and breadth of meaning, to react more thoughtfully and critically to ideas apprehended, and to use ideas gained from reading with increasing discrimination as guides to further thinking and action.

In support of her thesis, Miss Theodore offered three research studies which had investigated the maturity of interpretation of readers at various grade levels. In view of the fact that such studies have demonstrated an urgent need for training in breadth and depth of interpretation at all levels of reading maturity, Miss Theodore urged that promoting growth toward maturity in reading should be a directive goal for all teachers.

Miss Socher, in dealing with the teaching of developmental reading at college level, mentioned that reading courses and clinics should be available to the general as well as the special student. All instructors in college ought to be interested in reading and in the student's ability to read. According to Miss Socher, all good college teachers have always helped improve reading. Content teachers in highly specialized areas such as business, sociology, and law are best able to teach their students how to read for the concepts in those areas. Miss Socher suggested that there is a need for a higher level of reading maturity in college and that developmental courses in secondary school might help supply the need. The need in college is for the versatile reader—one who has purpose in reading, can

change speeds, has depth of comprehension, can adapt rate to purpose, and can read critically, getting facts, making inferences, and making judgments.

Mr. Cosper, approaching the teaching of reading in college from the linguistics point of view, demonstrated through reference to Walker's "Big Boom in Good Books" and to the spread of reading in colleges, high schools, and among adults that there is an increase in reading among the literate population. He pointed out the great variety of aids available for the teaching of reading today in the multiplicity of books, instruments for reading improvement, films, and guidance techniques. Mr. Cosper mentioned some of the recent studies which have measured the correlation between reading ability and success in college and the relation of empathy to reading in literary and non-literary materials. Finally, linguistics can make a larger contribution to reading than it already does. English teachers, without additional training in psychology and other areas, can, on the basis of their knowledge of language, contribute largely to reading improvement. English teachers also need to aid in closing the gaps in research.

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Finder of Chicago asked Mr. Cosper, "But do English teachers know linguistics?" In reply, Mr. Cosper stated that those who did not know linguistics might catch up on them. Other questions concerned the kinds of materials which could be used in a reading course and whether literary materials or non-literary materials were preferable.

Attendance: 50

Chairman: Morton Botel, Bucks County Board of Education, Doylestown, Pennsylvania
Speakers: Georgia Theodore, Chicago Teachers College
 Russell Cosper, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
 Elona Socher, Temple University, Philadelphia
Recorders: Frances Oakes, Kendall College, Evanston, Illinois
 Samuel Weingarten, Wright Junior College, Chicago

Four-Session Workshops

A. *Special Problems of the Composition/Communication Course in Junior Colleges*

Workshop A, dealing with the composition-communication course in the junior college, met for four sessions. This was the second workshop on this subject, the first having met at Chicago in 1957.

At the first session, Miss Catherine Adler of Joliet Junior College (Illinois) summarized the material in last year's report on entrance standards and grouping of students by ability. The workshop then discussed whether the junior college program should differ from that of the four-year college and university; whether composition and other forms of communication should be integrated or taught separately; how the instruction in composition-communication can be made to carry over into other courses the student is taking; and how postgraduate work of students may be forecast.

The second session, also directed by Miss Adler, was given over to a discussion of themes, particularly theme-correction. The workshop considered how often themes should be given and of what length, whether there should be a research theme and when it should be given, the various methods of correcting and grading themes, and the strengths and weaknesses of each method.

The third session, led by Mr. Walter Rauch of Westchester Community College (New York), dealt with texts and other reading materials. Mr. Rauch first considered the various tests available for determining the performance and aptitude of freshman students; he then discussed several texts. The workshop then discussed this material and also considered the need for remedial reading programs, ways to get students to read, and ways to evaluate a program in reading.

The fourth session was given over to making final recommendations. Two recommendations were submitted directly

to Mr. Glenn Leggett, next year's Associate Chairman, for transmission to the Executive Committee. These recommendations are as follows:

1. It is recommended that a committee be set up to specify the content and standards of Freshman English courses; and that this committee, in its report, clearly delimit the areas of remedial (subfreshman) English and the standard course in Freshman English.
2. It is recommended that a survey be undertaken of junior college alumni five years after graduation to permit teachers to become informed of student evaluation of their junior college experience with English; to compare the English achievement of the junior college graduate with that of the four-year college graduate; and to determine in specific terms the kinds of reading in general and popular literature, recreational literature, and scientific literature that is being done.

The other recommendations, made to be included in this report, are as follows:

1. Remedial classes should be held to fifteen students each; other classes should be held to twenty-five students. No instructor should be expected to teach more than three sections of Freshman English.
2. The program for the transfer student should not vary from that offered by the four-year college.
3. The Junior College Workshop should be continued in 1959, with the group later dividing into interest groups—one for composition and one for communication.
4. All composition-communication teachers should be urged to work closely with other departments so that good writing may appear in all classes.
5. A proficiency test should be given at the end of the sophomore year; a follow-up check should be made of alumni five years after graduation to determine their own evaluation of their communication-composition course; a

check should be made with the state university to determine the progress of junior college transfer students as compared with four-year students.

6. Ten to twelve standard themes should be given each semester, plus other types of writing (book reviews, paragraphs, summaries).
7. The research paper should be taught in all standard freshman composition-communication courses.
8. Each student should be given, at the beginning of his work, a statement of the standards set up for the grading of themes. The University of Illinois bulletin on this subject was commended.
9. A comment should be placed on each theme, with a positive comment coming first. Good content should always be recognized, even if mechanics are poor.
10. Standardized tests should be used for placement, with definite breakdowns into spelling, grammar, diction, punctuation, and other such items. Consideration should also be given to the student's high-school record in English.
11. Although the texts available appear adequate for most purposes, there is a need for a text which will incorporate the newer linguistic approaches on a level understandable to the lower-division student.
12. Remedial programs should be continued as long as there is a need for them.
13. For communications programs, a tape recorder and 35mm. slides are useful and it is recommended that new tape recordings and slides useful in

developing communication skills be developed.

14. A study should be made of the time required to check, grade, and comment on themes.

Though the matter was discussed, no conclusion was reached concerning whether the terminal student should be given a different course from the transfer student.

Chairman: Robert P. Saalbach, Scottsbluff Junior College, Scottsbluff, Nebraska

Co-Chairman: Ernest Fleischer, Fashion Institute of Technology, New York, New York

Secretary: Marian McAnally, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois

Co-Secretary: Esther Herr, Mesa Junior College, Grand Junction, Colorado

Resource: Catherine M. Adler, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois

Walter Rauch, Westchester Community College, White Plains, New York

Eloise N. Courter, State University of New York, Canton

Constance DeMuzio, Bay Park Junior College, Bay City, Michigan

Jocelyn P. Goss, Virginia State College, Norfolk

Sister M. Inez Hanley, Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan

Jim El Byrd Harris, Hinds Junior College, Raymond, Mississippi

Sister Mary JoAnne, Nazareth, La Grange, Illinois

Allen H. Jones, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Maryland

P. A. Kildahl, Brainerd Junior College, Brainerd, Minnesota

Mother Gerald Kelleher, Marymount Junior College, Arlington, Virginia

F. P. Kroeger, Flint Community College, Flint, Michigan

Burling Lowrey, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Maryland

Helen McNitt, York Junior College, York, Pennsylvania

Lois Nochmann, Highland Park Junior College, Highland Park, Michigan

Vera C. Smith, Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois

Paul H. Stacy, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

B. Advanced Discussion of Linguistics

The purpose of this workshop was to consider problems in the description of English structure rather than to win converts to linguistics as an approach to language study. This report summarizes most of the discussions, but a few are not reported because they could not be reported accurately in a few words.

1. *Juncture-stress patterns and punctuation.* There was general agreement that some correlation exists between

juncture-stress patterns in speech and marks of punctuation in writing but that they are separate systems and do not always agree. Any mark of punctuation and any major juncture shows the end of some word group, but neither system can be derived in full from the other. For example, a comma can be used after some word groups ended by single-bar (level) juncture, by double-bar (rising), and by double-cross (fading). A period

may be used after word groups ended by the last two junctures, although it is most common after word groups ended by the last. The constructions whose punctuation correlates most closely with juncture are non-restrictive clauses and appositives and introductory adverbial constructions. Juncture-stress patterns are chosen to express particular meanings, and if a passage is read so as to express this meaning, the resulting pattern may suggest an appropriate punctuation. However, punctuation practices vary with style and period, e.g., they have changed in the last hundred years, and there are some dialectal differences in juncture-stress patterns.

2. *Vocalization as an aid to writing.* Reading aloud in a conversational manner was recommended. An unsophisticated writer may not be aware of the vocal choices in what he writes and may, as a result, frame sentences with structural ambiguities, e.g., "started in about five days late." The aim is to select constructions which direct the reader to the supra-segmental constituents ("intonation") that convey the intended meaning.

3. *Correlation of semantic differences with grammatical differences.* This discussion brought out many possibilities in and much need for further study of correlations between total grammatical properties and meaning differentiations. Some examples were "that is to say" and "he is to say (something)"; past participles in pre-positive position, e.g., "the distressed sailor" but not "the disappeared sailor" (trying a preceding *very* is not always useful, for we have "a banished sailor" but not "a very banished sailor"); and pre-positive adjectives, e.g., we say "long green ship" but not "green long ship" in talking about current ships.

The distinction which Martin Joos has raised between "public verbs" and "private verbs" was discussed. Statements made with the first type are publicly verifiable, but those made with the sec-

ond rest on the word of the speaker. For example, *see* (private verb when it means "perceive") expresses both present narrative and present habitual meaning with a single-word form, but *look at* (public verb) expresses present narrative meaning with a phrasal form ("is looking at it now") and present habitual meaning with a simple form ("looks at it every day").

The occasional differentiation of noun meaning by grammatical properties was pointed out. Possible meanings of *glass* are separated thus: "He bought some glass" (mass), but "He bought a glass" (count). On the other hand, "The glass is broken" is ambiguous.

The following pair brings out two problems.

He called me (said I was) a waiter.

He called me (got me) a taxi.

The Harris-Chomsky transformation device helps one problem. (Transformations are substitutable constructions, e.g., "The boy likes him" is equivalent to "He is liked by the boy.") The second sentence transforms to "He called a taxi for me" but there is no equivalent transformation for the first. Transformation grammar was discussed in connection with other situations as well.

Another problem is resolved by appeal to "substitute groups." (Here, "substitute group" is defined by the personal pronoun which may be substituted for a member of the group.) The two complements in the first sentence belong to the same substitute group (*he*), and those in the second sentence belong to different substitute groups (*he* and *it*).

A scheme was presented for differentiating between the meanings of finite verb formations (*grows*, *is growing*, etc.). Essentially the scheme consisted of setting up mutually exclusive adverbial contexts for the finite formations (*often*, *now*, etc.).

A correlation between position and meaning, affecting some adverbs, was pointed out. For example, "Clearly, he saw the car" but "He saw the car clearly." This led to a general discussion of the functions of words like *up*, *down*, etc., when they followed verbs. Thus: "He climbed up the ladder" but not "He climbed the ladder up." "He rolled up the rug" or "He rolled the rug up." Also, "He started the music over" and "He turned down (rejected) the plan." Idiolectal differences were noted in the supra-segmental constituents of the final pattern.

4. *Analytical procedures.* The group agreed that any utterance contains at least two "orders" of constituents, one segmental (word formation, inflection, etc.) and the other supra-segmental (pitch, stress, and juncture). Theoretically the analysis of one order should agree with the analysis of the other. Some problems remain, however, in dealing with both orders and in correlating the two.

One problem is in the definition of the word, e.g., is *used to* ("He used to smoke") one word or two; probably one. Does English have infixes, e.g., in "two sons-in-law"? What is the inflected element in "the boy across the street's sister"? Another problem is idiolectal difference in the supra-segmental order.

Theoretically, juncture points indicate immediate constituent divisions and a hierarchy of cuts can be worked out from supra-segmental constituents which will reveal the levels of constituency. But: "The minute you go beyond certain points, the phonology varies with the idiolect." And: The first cut, by juncture, in "I see the services are finally unified" does not agree with the division into subject and predicate, as these terms are now used.

Persons wishing to know more about syntax through phonology were referred to the recent book by A. A. Hill.

The problem of equivalency was introduced. One proposal was that there are three areas: word-classes, distinguished by first immediate constituent to the base, (*active, boys, the man, etc.*); functions, performed by words and constructions (*boys, whoever comes, etc.*, perform nominal functions); and utterance constituents, such elements as subject, complement, etc. The second areas are differentiated because an element in nominal function may be subject or complement.

5. *Comments by individuals.* Speech is redundant. The degree to which we employ all the constituents is related to our fear of being misunderstood, e.g., when we talk with someone whose idiolect differs considerably from our own. It is difficult to determine what the minimum operational signals are in any given utterance.

Idiolectal variations in the supra-segmental constituents make the formulation of a general grammar a difficult task.

The nature of linguistic communication is such that perhaps we should not attempt to cover all peripheral material in our definitions but should concentrate on the definition of central material.

Freshman composition is perhaps not the place in the total school program where the results of linguistic analysis will, in time, prove most useful, but it is a valuable beachhead in the effort to get a better understanding of the language and a better theory of language into the total program.

Linguistics and composition are not the same subject.

Linguistics still has no complete canon for English structure. Texts are progress reports. Syntax is the least certain; phonology the most certain.

Chairman: Sumner Ives, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana
Co-Chairman: Nelson Francis, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Secret
Uni
Co-Se
Col
Resou
tuch
Gen
U
Dav
F
Audie
Flo
Jerom
wa
Howe
der
Mort
van
Hele
Danie
Mi
Morr
dia
Danie
ne
Marg
Yo
Glad
ka
Don
Sc
Garl
vi
Fran
Ca
Jam
Fr
Ern
D
Jay
V
Kar
Mor
Mrs

qu
the
ed
(1
the
vis
ce
th
da
to
re
by
fe
th
fe
re

Secretary: Priscilla Tyler, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
Co-Secretary: David A. Conlin, Arizona State College, Tempe
Resource: George P. Faust, University of Kentucky, Lexington
 Gerald Dykstra, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York
 David A. Munro, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 Audie L. Adkinson, Pensacola Junior College, Florida
 Jerome W. Archer, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Howard N. Bernstein, U. S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut
 Morton Botel, Bucks County Schools, Pennsylvania
 Helen Brennan, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Daniel V. Brogan, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Morrison Brown, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania
 Daniel V. Bryan, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Margaret M. Bryant, Brooklyn College, New York
 Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock University, Arkansas
 Donald Cain, Drexel Institute and Philadelphia School Administration, Pennsylvania
 Garland Cannon, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Francis Christensen, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
 James E. Clappe, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan
 Ernest S. Clifton, North Texas State College, Denton
 Jay L. Curtis, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
 Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown University, Ohio
 Morris Finder, Fenger High School, Chicago
 Mrs. Lucile P. Folk, Louisiana Tech, Ruston

Raymond W. Ford, Jr., State Teachers College, Kutztown, Pennsylvania
 Mary Elizabeth Fowler, Teachers College of Connecticut, New Britain
 James R. Glenn, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania
 James D. Gordon, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 Eleanor R. Gorna, Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania
 Ernest W. Gray, University of Toledo, Ohio
 Jayne C. Harder, Youngstown University, Ohio
 Kellogg W. Hunt, Florida State University, Tallahassee
 Falk S. Johnson, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago
 James B. McMillan, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 Jack Patnode, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota
 Grace Preisser, Rhode Island College of Education, Providence
 C. J. Raeth, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
 John C. Sherwood, University of Oregon, Eugene
 Paul H. Stacy, George Washington University, District of Columbia
 Norman C. Stageberg, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 Erwin R. Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Robertson Straun, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg
 George G. Struble, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pennsylvania
 Thomas H. Wetmore, Ball State, Muncie, Indiana
 William S. Wight, University of Miami, Florida
 A. G. Wilcox, Pennsylvania State University, Hazleton Center
 Gordon Wilson, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
 Samuel Workman, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago
 Elizabeth T. Wright, George Washington University, District of Columbia

C. Theme Reading and Grading

At the first session of the workshop the question of the standards for college theme writing and grading were discussed. This topic raised two other questions: (1) What is the purpose of grading themes? The consensus was that a revised theme gives the student an acceptable standard of written English, that the student moves toward this standard by correcting the theme according to the instructor's marks. Whether such revised themes should be gone over again by the instructor was a moot point, some feeling that this was too much to ask of the overburdened theme-reader, others feeling that the instructor should keep re-reading the theme until it was satisfac-

tory, most feeling that a spot check of theme revisions was enough. (2) What is the purpose of the theme? The answers to this question showed some agreement on the principle of assigning early themes for developing skills in mechanics, later themes for developing a sense of organization and style. The foregoing discussion led to a generalized statement of standards for themes: (1) that the theme should say something worth saying, (2) that it should demonstrate such aspects of clear thinking as acceptable development, coherence, and logic, and (3) that it should be free of mechanical errors. Several other topics were discussed at this first meeting with no general agree-

ment: whether a double grade should be given a theme; whether the primary function of the theme grade is punitive or evaluative; whether the standards that we demand are standards for the world at large, for other members of the faculty, or for other members of the English department.

At the second meeting of the workshop discussion turned to the problem of quantity. Members of the workshop reported the practices of their institutions, and while there was a wide variation in these practices, from the twice-weekly theme requirement of one to the bi-weekly theme requirement of another, the typical situation was something a little less than a theme a week, written both in class and out of class. Again the question of standards was broached, whether the standards should be absolute throughout the semester, or whether they should vary, becoming increasingly stiffer. Again a variety of practices reported was too wide to be accurately summarized. The meeting in general agreed that every paper deserved some attention from the instructor, that conferences with individual students were a valuable method of theme consideration, and that as much writing as possible, in and out of class, was desirable.

At the third meeting, Alfred H. Marks of Ball State Teachers College demonstrated his methods of presenting themes and theme correction to a class by use of an opaque projector. The method is mechanically complex and is probably not feasible in an institution not equipped with a well-subsidized audiovisual-aids department to handle the details. Mr. Mark's method is to project the theme onto a special screen, then to make corrections of the theme with a special crayon writing directly on the image of the theme, thus showing the class the process of theme correction. The question was raised whether the audio as well as the visual was not important in pre-

senting a theme to a class, that is the reading of themes to give the sound of the language. The teacher probably does a better job of reading than the student, perhaps "improving" the theme through a smooth reading. But it was stressed that reading aloud shows up both awkwardness and faulty mechanics as well as good style. The question of standards for theme grading was again raised, and various opinions were expressed on the following questions: How much weight should be given to format, to mechanics and usage, and to logic and content? How much misspelling should be accepted from the college student? How much should the student be penalized for such serious errors as sentence fragments and comma splices? How much should the teacher consider the changes in language such as the use of *like* as a conjunction?

The final meeting of the workshop was addressed by Gerhard Friedrich of Haverford College, who spoke on the standards set up by the Advanced Placement Program, of which he is a part. As outlined by Mr. Friedrich, the standards which must be emphasized in grading student writing are (1) substance, (2) organization, (3) logic, (4) precision of style, (5) fluency of style, (6) proficiency in mechanics. Mr. Friedrich discussed the advancement that can be expected of a student in a year of college writing. At the end of high school, the student writes in an "obtrusive learned pattern." At the end of a year of Freshman English, the pattern should no longer obtrude; there should be more flexibility, as well as subtlety, in the student's writing; and most important, the student should be able to deal with a complex problem and give it a unified treatment. Mr. Friedrich also suggested that the student should have something to say, that a theme can meet most of the requirements and still say nothing; that the standards should be developed

through
can be
use of
studen
that t
corre
that
time
mere
more
ough
To
most
stand
ods
to th
gene
er of
Chair
ing
Co-C
Un
Secre
Un
Co-S
er
Reso
no
Al
Reve
Se
Will
Rob
St
Ebe
P
Ger
P
Lou
le
Sis
R
Fra
v
Ma
A
Sis
I
Sis
C
He
C
Ch
Si
H
H

throughout the year; that the standards can be best shown to the students by use of concrete examples in the form of student themes duplicated for class use; that the instructor should summarize his corrections into areas of weaknesses and that no more than one weakness at a time should be concentrated on; and that mere mechanical correctness merits no more than a passing grade, for mechanics ought to develop into effective style.

To summarize, this workshop directed most of its attention on the two areas of standards for theme grading and of methods of presenting the corrected themes to the students. As might be expected, no general agreement was to be had in either of these areas.

Chairman: Frances B. Huston, Eastern Washington College of Education, Cheney

Co-Chairman: Bruce Clark, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

Secretary: Richard Cutts, Pennsylvania State University Center, DuBois

Co-Secretary: Kenneth E. Harris, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Resource: W. C. Jackman, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

Alfred H. Marks, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Reverend James G. Alexander, S.C.J., Kilgore Seminary, Honesdale, Pennsylvania

William C. Baker, Youngstown University, Ohio

Robert N. Barrows, Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pennsylvania

Eben E. Bass, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania

Geri D. Bass, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania

Louise H. Beasley, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City

Sister Mary Carolyn, C.B.S., Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois

Frank J. Chiarenza, Hillyer College of the University of Hartford, Connecticut

Major John H. Chitty, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York

Sister M. Clarita, Ursuline College, Louisville, Kentucky

Sister Regina Clase, Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pennsylvania

Helen K. Cramer, The University of Toledo, Ohio

Charles M. Davis, Houghton College, New York

Sister Mary Ellen, Immaculate College, Immaculate, Pennsylvania

Herman A. Estrin, Newark College of Engineering, New Jersey

H. Alfred Farrell, Lincoln University, Pennsylvania

Feurs H. Fendlesin, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Dudley Ferris, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York

Delmont-St. Daniels Fleming, Student

Brother G. Francis, F.S.C., La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Gerhard Friedrich, Haverford College, Pennsylvania

Eleanor R. Garner, Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania

Fred I. Godshalle, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Isabel S. Gordon, Bronx High School of Science, New York, New York

Dorothy H. Gould, Westtown School, Pennsylvania

Edward Grier, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Frank Hook, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Helen K. Hyatt, Trenton Junior College, New Jersey

Helen E. King, Waynesburg College, Uniontown Center, Pennsylvania

Zelma Leonhard, University of Illinois, Chicago

Bell Lindsey, Hinds Junior College, Raymond, Mississippi

John MacPherson, Xavier Junior College, Sydney, Nova Scotia

Sister James Marie, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

Margaret McMichael, Springfield High School, Delaware County, Pennsylvania

Sidney H. Mitchell, Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia

Sister Mary Modesta, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

Sister M. Orita, Ursuline College, Louisville, Kentucky

Phil M. Patton, United States Air Force Academy, Denver, Colorado

John M. Philippo, Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pennsylvania

Reverend Cyril A. Reilly, Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa

Robert C. Schweik, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Ruby T. Scott, University of Toledo, Ohio

Mary Ann Sherik, Glassboro State Teachers College, New Jersey

Cherry Shik, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut

Amy A. Thompson, Rhode Island College of Education, Providence

Eleanor Traizler, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Francis O. Voci, Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland

Mildred F. Walker, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston

Louise Ward, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Ora Williams, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

H. Alan Wycherly, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

James E. Yockel, Rochester Institute of Technology, New York

D. *Special Problems of the Freshman Course in Liberal Arts Colleges*

For the purposes of Workshop D, "liberal arts college" was defined as an institution not closely connected with a university. Hence the teaching staff would include few graduate student assistants; and the students would be undertaking little undergraduate professional or technological study. No other limitation was set on the discussion.

A mimeographed list of suggested topics for discussion was furnished participants, distributed into four areas corresponding to the four workshop sessions. For the first session was suggested the general theme, "What students should be enrolled in a Freshman English course, and what in general should the course do for them?"; for the second session, "What kinds of writing, elicited by what means, are appropriate to such a course?"; for the third session, "What kinds of reading, engaged in for what purposes, are relevant to Freshman English?"; and for the final session, "How should the teaching staff be selected, and how can its interest in and enthusiasm for such teaching be sustained?" The discussion, however, reflected less the pre-fabricated outline than the problems brought to the workshop by participants.

At the first session, the topics chiefly discussed were the exempting gifted students from Freshman English, and the possibility of allowing each freshman instructor to give his own course. Only one institution represented was prepared to exempt a gifted student from all further college study of English; but common practices are a reduction in the amount of English required, and substitution of more advanced courses for some or all of the freshman work. Opinion was divided on whether the absence from a recitation section of the ablest students impedes the effectiveness of the class to a degree outweighing the advantages of exemption to the exempted student. As for the division

of English into "autonomous" sections, it was generally felt that this was practicable only at a small institution with a small staff.

The second session took off from a dissenting opinion: one of the participants reported a speaker at an evening session of the conference as saying that the amount of writing a student does has no direct bearing on the student's proficiency in writing. The dissenter agreed that improvement in student writing is correlated with the extent and kind of criticism he receives from the teacher; but if this is adequate, improvement in writing shows a positive correlation with its frequency. An informal poll disclosed that colleges represented required from eight to fifteen themes a semester, with most requiring eleven or more. There was general agreement that a few themes should be written impromptu, in class. There was marked difference of opinion whether the practice of awarding two grades to a paper—one for content, and another (invariably lower) for expression, including mechanics—is or is not pedagogically and morally justified. The practice, in any event, seems widespread. Also widespread is a rule that more than three elementary errors in mechanics (grammar, crucial punctuation, common misspellings) in a theme of five hundred words fails the theme. Passing to a somewhat loftier level, the workshop discussed the effectiveness of teaching elementary formal logic along with the organization of the paragraph and the theme. Doubt was expressed that formal logic was familiar to English teachers, or well adapted to a discipline which is likely to be rhetorical as much as it is logical. The session finally found itself so absorbed in discussion of the particular needs of the foreign student as to threaten the balance of the workshop's program, and therefore voted unanimously that the Execu-

tive Committee of the CCCC be requested to include a two-panel workshop on college English for foreign students in the program of the next spring conference. One point deserves record: a program devised for the foreigner coming to visit this country for one or two or even four years may not be in all respects suitable for the refugee or other immigrant intending to become a citizen; and vice versa.

The third session opened with a full description of a freshman course formerly given at the speaker's institution, in which practice in writing was integrated with reading chosen to illustrate and survey the humanities—not literature only, but architecture, painting, and music as well. The ensuing discussion turned upon the following questions: Can adequate attention to so complex an activity as writing subsist alongside attention to so rich and diversified a program of reading? Is the best reading for students what is "great" and therefore rather beyond them at the freshman level, what is drawn from topics and situations current in his own time and place? And, finally, should the student be chiefly practised in commentary on and criticism of standard models, or should the student write in those forms and on those topics he will need in daily life? About the only indisputable point that emerged is that on these issues, teachers in a communication program take a relatively terrestrial, and those in a composition program, a relatively celestial view. One of the latter, indeed, has found composition of poetry a valuable activity for *all* students.

In the final session, it was recognized that in staffing a Freshman English course, a source of difficulty is that most instructors prefer teaching literature to teaching composition; moreover, the training furnished by graduate schools is almost entirely in literature. However,

discussion evoked the statement that success in teaching composition depends more on an "engaged" attitude on the teacher's part, than on any specialized aptitude. It was agreed that the curriculum of the Freshman English course should be devised democratically, every member of the teaching staff having a vote in decisions; that teachers are likely to be happiest in a course with a minimal common content, with considerable freedom supplementing this "core"; that some form of "in-service" training is desirable for young composition teachers—for example, an older teacher may be paired as "mentor" with a younger, each visiting some classes conducted by the other, and reading some themes graded by the other; and finally, that a common terminal examination can be a valuable educational device, particularly if some papers—for example, those of students failing the course, or awarded distinction—are graded by more than one teacher. In general, colleges should recognize that an instructor in his first year of service needs special help learning the standards of the institution.

Chairman: F. Cudworth Flint, Dartmouth College

Co-Chairman: James T. Farrell, St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Indiana

Secretary: Donald S. Heines, Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey

Co-Secretary: Mrs. Marie M. Meyer, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota

Resource: Cecil Blue, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri
Ben W. Fuson, Park College, Parkville, Missouri

Edith A. Bigelow, Springfield High School, Massachusetts

Francis E. Bowman, Duke University

Sam Bradley, Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pennsylvania

Frank L. Christ, Loyola College, Baltimore

Morth William Daley, Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson, New York

Rutherford Delmage, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York

Sister Mary Emmanuel Divine, Gwynedd Mercy Junior College, Pennsylvania

Sister M. Dolores, Gwynedd Mercy Junior College, Pennsylvania

Daniel J. Dougherty, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia

Meta R. Emberger, University of Louisville, Kentucky

Dorothy H. Eshleman, Penn State University, University Park
 Mrs. Anna D. Faber, Lebanon Valley College
 Raymond C. Franke, Elizabethtown College, Pennsylvania
 Sister Gertrude Lenore, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia
 William W. Griffith, Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia
 Sister Mary Inez Hanley, Mercy College, Detroit
 A. Ben Horlacher, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania
 Helen E. King, Waynesburg College, Pennsylvania
 Strang Lawson, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
 Donald H. Letendre, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts
 Nancy E. Lewis, Denison University, Granville, Ohio
 Mary A. McGuire, Chatham College, Pittsburgh

Sister Mary Louis Morgan, Ursuline College, Cleveland
 John P. Mullen, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia
 Gertrude E. Noyes, Connecticut College, New London
 David S. Perry, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York
 Robert W. Russell, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
 Edith Stone, Washington Missionary College, Washington, D. C.
 Mother Berchmans Walsh, Marymount Junior College, New York City
 Ralph S. Wehner, Thiel College, Greenville, Pennsylvania
 Sara Wilhelm, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio
 Eloise Wilson, Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey
 Donald L. Young, Boston University

E. *Teaching Students to Write for Business and Industry*

The workshop first discussed the kinds of jobs that college graduates have as they enter business and industry and the writing situations that confront them. In the remaining sessions the group was concerned with college methods of instruction designed to prepare students to meet these writing situations.

Many of the fields that college graduates enter, it was brought out, call for the writing of highly technical reports. Several workshop members thought that these reports, especially those of engineers, should be written by the individuals responsible for them. The writer should consider the readers and their various levels, should adapt his report to the material and the use of the report, and should be clear and concise. The group thought that good English is the quality most desired by business and industry.

Some colleges, it developed, are training students to be professional technical writers and believe that this field offers students a good future. Only those students who have demonstrated proficiency in writing and who have a good scientific and technical background are accepted in the professional technical writ-

ing courses. The technical writer must be able to interpret data and must have facility in the use of language.

Various methods of preparing students to write reports were presented. Note-taking on cards, with one point to a card, will facilitate the organization of a report. Outlining was considered especially important for the long report. Some schools have the students present a proposal report or a letter to the instructor before they begin a project for a long report. The conference method seems to be used effectively. One college places its best students in report writing in a tutorial group and encourages them to write for technical publications. Case studies or practical problems have furnished incentive and variety in the writing of reports.

Realistic assignments in teaching letter writing, it was pointed out, also help the students to adapt their writing to the situation. The writing of good business letters seems to require a skill somewhat different from that called for in the writing of reports. For example, the problem of structure in a letter is not so acute as it is in a report, but there is much greater emphasis on style.

Assigning specific report-writing or letter-writing problems was accepted favorably by the workshop. It was recommended, however, that the problems be changed frequently so as to discourage plagiarism.

It was pointed out that several firms publish good booklets on report writing. Among the firms mentioned were Johns Manville, McGraw Hill, the Minneapolis Honeywell Company, the Royal Bank of Canada, and General Motors.

In response to the question, "Just what does industry expect from college graduates in respect to their writing ability?" 70 engineering firms, it was brought out, listed planning and organizing reports and writing concisely as very important. Other companies want men who have a broad education in the humanities as well as in technical subjects—"the complete man."

From the discussions it was evident that more research should be conducted on the kinds of writing situations that confront college graduates when they enter industry. But it was also clear that the colleges represented in the workshop were assigning realistic writing problems to their students and were leading the

students to vary their writing according to the situation.

Chairman: Grady G. Stubbs, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan
Co-Chairman: Sterg O'Dell, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia
Secretary: Ferdinand J. Ward, C. M., DePaul University, Chicago
Co-Secretary: John A. Hertz, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Resource: A. S. Limouze, Maritime College, State University of New York, New York
 Richard A. Wells, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh
 Sarah Bissell, University of Toledo, Ohio
 Margaret D. Bickle, Ohio State University, Columbus
 James E. Clappe, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan
 Russell N. DeVinney, Pennsylvania State University, Wilkes-Barre Center
 Francis E. Drake, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Edward G. Fisher, Colorado School of Mines, Golden
 Sister Mary Charles, Immaculate College, Immaculate, Pennsylvania
 Alton C. Morris, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Norman B. Moyes, West Liberty State College, West Liberty, West Virginia
 Lois C. Schuette, University of Pittsburgh
 Ruby T. Scott, University of Toledo, Ohio
 George K. Seacrist, Pennsylvania State University, York Center
 Lee L. Snyder, Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia
 Robert M. Welsh, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia
 Thayer A. Westlake, Temple Community College, Philadelphia
 Cecil B. Williams, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater

F. The Advanced Course in Expository Writing: Aims, Texts, Methods

Officers of the workshop were introduced, and members of the group identified themselves. Elias Phillips reported briefly on previous CCCC workshops on the subject of advanced writing courses.

Participants described briefly the nature of the advanced exposition course or courses in their several institutions. Courses were revealed as being either elective and open to juniors and seniors interested in the problems of writing beyond the prescribed freshman course or prescribed courses for juniors in certain majors, especially in universities (e.g., Ohio State and Penn State). Such courses are not technical in approach and dif-

fer from courses in engineering English (so called), report writing, and the like.

It became apparent that there is some tendency toward the establishment of required courses in exposition to supplement the training of the freshman year, and the question arose whether there should be an advanced course for students who have passed Freshman English but whose command of the skills of writing is still not adequate. The consensus was that perhaps such a course should exist, but that it should not be the same as the advanced exposition course under consideration at the moment.

It was agreed that in an advanced exposition course students may justifiably be expected to know and use the fundamental decencies of English. Whatever the course may be, it is not a remedial course.

In the early discussions on the purpose and scope of the course it was generally agreed that it is broad in its range, that exposition may legitimately include many modes of writing sometimes delimited in separate categories, and that in effect within expository writing the work may and should include the gamut from factual reporting to, but not including, pure narrative. It was felt that the distinctions often drawn in the past between "pure" types are artificial and stultifying.

The group spent the second session discussing about two dozen textbooks, several of which were available for close examination through the courtesy of publishers' representatives. The discussion revealed wide variation in use of texts. Some members reported using both a rhetoric and a book of readings, others a rhetoric only, still others a book of readings or current magazines only, and a few no text at all.

Two factors helped to account for this variation. While the course is required of all or nearly all students on some campuses, it is elective on others. Each semester the required course serves hundreds of students of widely varying interest and ability in writing. Those teaching the required course find the more formalized textbook approach essential with a heterogeneous group, especially since conference time is extremely limited. The elective course, on the other hand, serves students with genuine interest in writing. Since classes are often small, writing problems are handled in individual conference and a wide variety of reading materials is used.

The second factor which helped to account for the variation in use of texts was

the interpretation of the term *exposition*. Some members of the group restricted the term to reporting, analysis, and persuasion through such vehicles as definition, classification, process, point of view, and argument, while others used the term more broadly to include the familiar and formal essay and narrative and descriptive techniques.

At the third session it was generally agreed that classes in advanced exposition should not have more than 20 students, and that 15 to 18 is the optimum enrollment. Much interest was aroused by the practice, described by one member of the group, of giving progress reports based on several papers at intervals throughout the term rather than giving grades on each paper.

On the question of fixed or free assignments it was found that many teachers give a mixture, some fixed, some free. Where a free assignment is given, it is often limited to a specific structural framework, e.g., process, analysis, satire, etc.

All were in favor of having some papers written in class. Such papers, it was felt, should be in a mode or form the students have already used on out-of-class papers and should be on a subject related to something they have already written about.

On the subject of revision, one member suggested having a class start a paper in class, in a sort of laboratory session, and revise and complete it outside class, to be handed in at a later meeting. Another suggested as a useful practice having students do a complete rewriting of a paper they don't like. This is to involve a completely new approach to the same paper, not a simple patching of errors and weaknesses noted on the original.

It was generally agreed that attempts at combining and correlating papers in this course with assignments in other subjects and departments, e.g., history, were

on the whole unsuccessful and unprofitable.

On the length of assignments there was general agreement that papers should be from 500 words up in length. Several favored papers of 1000 to 1200 words in length, especially for informal research projects involving the use of source materials and quotations but without formal documentation. Such papers may often be assigned over a two-week period.

It was agreed that within the limits of time available to student and instructor individual writing projects are good. And there was some feeling that students should be allowed to submit writing done for off-campus purposes or for possible publication as part of the course work.

It was also felt that there is some merit in what may be called incremental assignments, in which one paper builds on a preceding one by enlarged development of some aspect of the first assignment. A simple variation of this is to have several papers successively increasing in scope and difficulty based on a given structure, such as definition.

At the final session, the group concluded that the course in intermediate and advanced exposition, a three-credit course at most schools, is usually built upon six semester or nine quarter credits of freshman composition. The course is difficult to describe because it is actually several courses: a multiple-section required course on some campuses; a small elective course on others; occasionally a course oriented to a particular vocational goal, such as teaching; and, rarely, a remedial course.

The group agreed that the course is currently gaining ground. While it was formerly elective, it is now being re-

quired of more and more students. Schools that have not offered it are planning to do so soon. Class size and the use of conferences seemed to affect grading practices. When classes were small and conferences a feature of the course, instructors often evaluated the paper but did not always grade it. Four factors seemed basic in evaluation: ideas, organization, language, and mechanics.

The group recommended that the workshop topic be pursued further next year in two two-session workshops, one for the required course and the other for the elective course.

Chairman: Hubert Smith, Utah State University, Logan

Co-Chairman: Andrew Kafka, Pennsylvania State University, Highacres Campus

Secretary: Virginia M. Burke, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Co-Secretary: Calvin Yost, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania

Resource: Harold L. Haley, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Elias H. Phillips, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Ralph Albaugh, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute

Paul Clark, The University of Hartford, Connecticut

Sister Mary Inez Hanley R.S.M., Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan

Samuel Hazo, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Myra B. Hicks, Ohio State University, Columbus

Alan B. Howes, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Bernetta Jackson, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

Linnie Keith, Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park, Maryland

Capt. Charles R. Kemble, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York

George F. McFarland, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York

Brother Pius, St. Mary's College, Winona, Minnesota

George Test, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania

Waters Turpin, Morgan State College, Baltimore

Cora Updyke, Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York

H. Alan Wycherley, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis

G. Grammar in the Composition/Communication Course: What Kind and How Much?

The varying and vigorous studies of language of recent years have, at least, stimulated varying and vigorous opinions

about how language should be studied in the composition/communication course.

From one point of view, the four sessions of the 1958 CCCC workshop on grammar revealed tenacious confusion about what we mean by the word *grammar*, and enthusiastic disagreement about what we should do with it, whatever it is. Some teachers looked on grammar as primarily usage; others divorced it from usage. Some considered it mainly classification of words into parts of speech; others found such classification misleading and useless. Some regarded it as necessary discipline—or punishment—for students; some as an unnecessary evil; some as a necessary preliminary to progress in use of the language. There was evangelistic zeal for a return to “fundamentals,” and widespread doubt about what “fundamentals” may be. Terms like “structure,” “linguistics,” or “sentence patterns” were viewed with reverence or suspicion. The old conflict between descriptive and prescriptive approaches persists. In fact, none of the old spectres seems permanently laid—or lain.

From another point of view, the workshop revealed considerable agreement in some basic attitudes toward grammar and its place in the composition/communication course. In general, the agreement became a compromise between traditional attitudes and approaches in some of the new studies of grammar.

The initial problem, and one that plagued discussions throughout the workshop, was that of terminology and definition. Most of the first session and much of others concerned definitions of “grammar” and attempts to keep discussions of it distinct from usage or semantics or rhetoric or other problems of writing. Mr. Strandness and Mr. Pooley introduced some definitions, and discussion by Mr. Brown, Mr. McCrimmon, Mrs. Reed, Mr. Siegel, Mr. Dykema, the chairman, and others finally led to general agreement on the definition in Mr. Pooley's *Teaching English Grammar*: “English grammar is the study of how English

is used . . . the observation of the forms and arrangements of English words as they are employed singly and in combination to convey meaning in discourse.” Attempts to define terms like “structural” or “functional” as applied to grammar were less successful. The workshop also agreed to limit its considerations to the usual first-year credit course, rather than remedial or honors programs.

With the discussion limited, participants in the workshop approached agreement also on the kind of grammar that should be taught.

Although there was debate on every point, a majority of the group distrusted the approach to grammar as a series of “rules” and also rejected emphasis on the traditional parts of speech as the basis of any system of grammar. Although they also expressed dissatisfaction with existing books on sentence patterns, they preferred a system which emphasized structure as the basis of grammatical study. They felt that grammar should examine such relationships as the subject-verb-complement pattern, co-ordination, and subordination and the devices of English for revealing these relationships. Most participants doubted that it was yet practical to abandon traditional terminology or to adopt grammars like those of Fries or Whitehall, but they did feel that a shift in emphasis toward a grammar based on sentence patterns was necessary.

Early in its discussion of the final problem of the workshop, how much grammar should be taught, the group found itself handicapped by lack of knowledge. Mr. McCrimmon, Mr. Corbett, and others pointed out that existing studies reveal no correlation between the study of grammar—traditional or other—and improvement in writing. The discussion also pointed out that existing studies are inadequate and unreliable, that we really do not know whether learning grammar

improves writing. Records showing that students who write well also do well on grammar tests may reveal only that intelligent and industrious students can learn more than one skill. Opinions of the group varied from "you might as well teach geography" to the view that grammar study was responsible for the development of most great writers. The group agreed, however, on the need for trustworthy experiments, effective attempts to determine the relations between teaching grammar and improving writing.

In spite of earlier debates and earlier skepticism the final session revealed general faith that grammar can be useful in teaching writing. Mr. Perry and Mr. Spotts, for example, discussed the uses of grammar in teaching punctuation. Mr. Strandness considered the value of studying relationships in sentences because the same relationships exist in larger units of discourse. The group examined problems in themes presented by Mrs. Reed and considered problems in some specific sentences. The workshop concluded with general agreement that grammar, describing relationships in the language, could be useful in teaching writing, that its purpose in the composition/communication course should be improvement of writing, and that we need further study of the possible correlation between a study of grammar and improvement of writing.

Chairman: Robert M. Gorrell, University of Nevada, Reno

Co-Chairman: T. B. Strandness, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Secretary: Libuse L. Reed, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware

Co-Secretary: Donald W. Lee, University of Connecticut, Storrs

Resource: James M. McCrimmon, University of Illinois, Urbana

Agnes E. McElwee, Pennsylvania State University, State College

Fannie C. Alston, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

William C. Baker, Youngstown University, Ohio

Gertrude Barr, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio

Francis E. Bowman, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

Philip Bradshaw, University of Florida, Gainesville

Joseph Lee Brown, Pennsylvania State University, Ogontz Center

L. E. Buchanan, Washington State College, Pullman

M. H. Buncombe, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Robert N. Burrows, Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pennsylvania

Florence B. Butler, Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York

Ernest S. Clifton, North Texas State College, Denton

Charline H. Conyers, Cheney State Teachers College, Cheney, Pennsylvania

Edward P. J. Corbett, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska

Russell Cosper, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Jay L. Curtis, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Pennsylvania

Vuran Davenport, Woodbury High School, Woodbury, New Jersey

Ernestine DuPont, Columbia Teachers College, New York

Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio

Herman A. Estrin, Newark College of Engineering, New Jersey

Winnie D. Evans, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston

Helen C. Exum, Kentucky State College, Frankfort

Delmont T. Fleming, Eastern Biblical College, St. Davids, Pennsylvania

Theodore Fletcher, Cheney State Teachers College, Cheney, Pennsylvania

W. Paul Hamilton, Montclair State Teachers College, New Jersey

Kelsie B. Harder, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio

T. F. Hawkes, University of Buffalo, New York

Judith Hinton, Woodbury High School, Woodbury, New Jersey

Kenneth W. Houpp, Pennsylvania State University, State College

Ralph E. Howes, Castleton Teachers College, Castleton, Vermont

Glenn O. Kelley, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, South Dakota

Donald S. Lawless, LeMoyne College, Syracuse, New York

Raymond L. Levy, University of Toledo, Ohio

Fred K. Lingle, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Sister M. Dolores, Gwynedd Mercy Junior College, Pennsylvania

Sister Mary Joanna, C.R.S.M., Academy of the Sisters of Mercy, Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania

Sister Mary Regina, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

Sister M. Suzanne, S. C., Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pennsylvania

J. W. McKay, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Elbert R. Moses, Jr., Michigan State University, East Lansing

Kline A. Nall, Texas Technological College, Lubbock

Herbert Nelson, Oregon State College, Corvallis

John Nicol, Waterloo College, Waterloo, Ontario

- William N. Ormond, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Orville Palmer, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey
 David Perry, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York
 Kathryn Pontzer, Lock Haven State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
 Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 John Rees, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
 Joseph E. Rhen, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania
 Elizabeth M. Schneider, Western College, Oxford, Ohio
 Elliott King Shapira, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts
 Merrill B. Sherman, University of Hartford, Connecticut
 Paul N. Siegel, Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York
 Carle B. Spotts, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
 Lizette Van Gelder, Howard College, Birmingham, Alabama
 Charles M. Waters, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee
 R. H. Weber, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
 Harold N. White, New Mexico Western College, Silver City
 Eloise Wilson, Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey

H. Theory in Communication

The context of a study of theory of communication is the need to identify clusters of points of view, which can be stated simply, to provide knowledge of relationships and processes which include all media and systems.

Certain questions must be asked in any study of theory in communication:

1. Should literature be included as a part of communication theory?
2. Should communication be considered a socio-physical science?
3. Is communication developing into a field with its own description: "a language of languages"—"Man and his symbolic relationships"?

Communication theory is relatively unexplored territory which many disciplines are viewing with their own telescopes. It might be best at present to view the unexplored from different points of view in an eclectic way. However, there seems to be a tendency toward integration of the various points of view into a single, interlaced "field" theory to account for all systems of communication.

Information Theory scheme can be used as a model but seems to be too mechanistic. However, it suggests that the observer is part of the communication process. This reflexive aspect is a desirable one.

Linguistic Theory holds that it is possible to distinguish language from writ-

ing, language from literature, and language from the meanings conveyed by language as existing prior to and continuing to condition the higher organization of these essentially derivative, constituent aspects of speech.

Structural linguists are in agreement with most semanticists, psychologists, et. al., in viewing relativistically the symbolic ordering of language, giving furthermore no credence to the platonically influenced conception of morphemic combinations, such as "beauty," "virtue," etc., or any single morphs, having absolute reference to eternal essences. But structural linguists themselves split, as well as argue with the semanticists on the question of whether "meaning" (structurally) inheres in single morphemes.

Linguistic theory at present is concerned with describing purely linguistic communication with a view to developing a unified theory of all communication modes. One of its weaknesses is a lack of concern for non-linguistic—e.g., pictorial—communication, which is concurrent with oral communication.

In *Behavioral Theory*, the movement from normative procedures to an acceptance of valuative considerations seems to be inevitable. In addition, there is recognition that the observer, with a value system, is not apart from any investigation or analysis.

The movement from specific theories to field theories, and molecular to molar examinations, however, should not be thought of as "replacing" but movement to another plane of observation to allow for specific, operational results as well as integrated, "interlaced" explanations of procedures and results. Added to this is the recognition of the simultaneity or trans-acting of factors and events.

Information theory and behavioral theory models seem workable and applicable at the ends but seem lacking in the area of encoding and decoding, and the area between.

Recent shifts in *Humanistic Thought* are:

1. from "occidental" to global civilizations
2. from "language and logic" to a broad view of symbol processes and systems
3. from the purely "objective" search to "non-conscious" mechanisms that drive human beings to bring order
4. from a hierarchy of approaches to a spectrum of values.

The modern humanist position is an "ought" position, so that the scientist can use his knowledge of "how" to get to the "what" and allow the scientific genius to discover the "why."

A second role of the humanist is the placing of value on the various, conflicting theories. A value, for instance, that we can support is: the purpose of communication theory is the extension of ability to know and use symbols.

Perhaps, the humanists have more to offer the social scientists in the way of "as if" than social scientists have to offer the humanists. In addition, humanities (should) deal with clusters of meaning, interacting meanings and symbols while social science, by its procedure, tends to operate out of labels to inquire and describe, and to modify the labels.

Chairman: Herbert Hackett, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York

Co-Chairman: Francis Shoemaker, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Secretary: Bernard A. Jenson, College for Teachers, Buffalo

Co-Secretary: Lawrence J. Levy, Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio

Edward L. Anderson, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

William D. Baker, College for Teachers, Buffalo, New York

Robert H. Bowers, University of Florida, Gainesville

Richard Carroll, State Teachers College, Cheyney, Pennsylvania

Herbert L. Carson, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Harry H. Crosby, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Ronald Cutler, University of Florida, Gainesville

Howard H. Dean, Montana State College, Bozeman

Edward R. Fagan, New York State Education Department, Albany

Louis Forsdale, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Warren G. French, Stetson University, DeLand, Florida

Philip A. Friedman, Wayne State University, Detroit

Walker Gibson, New York University, New York City

Don Hausdorff, Mohawk Valley Technical Institute, Utica, New York

Virginia S. Henderson, Woodbury Senior High School, New Jersey

Frank E. Hobson, Jr., Dean Junior College, Franklin, Massachusetts

Albert Karson, Mohawk Valley Technical Institute, Utica, New York

Robert G. Koch, Rochester Institute of Technology, New York

Robert Leopold, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Robert C. Lugton, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Kenneth Macrorie, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Roy Mitchell, Mohawk Valley Technical Institute, Utica, New York

Sterling Olmsted, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Utica, New York

Barbara Reynolds, Woodbury Senior High School, New Jersey

Solomon Simonson, State Teachers College, Fredonia, New York

Rhodes Stabley, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania

Eleanor Ward, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

Charles Weingartner, Mohawk Valley Technical Institute, Utica, New York

I. *The Role of the Composition-Communication Course*

At the end of six hours of exhaustive yet not exhausting discussion by some twenty-four lively and dedicated people, the conclusion drawn was that General Education is having an influence for the good far beyond the sphere of the few integrated programs currently in operation. The University of Illinois representative reported that a committee there was considering General Education for all students; and the Boston University representative reported that two colleges had completed integrated programs which had strongly influenced still others. The many courses deriving from the early Columbia experiments and the Harvard Report on General Education have had a leavening influence all across the country. Even in colleges where there are no courses called General Education, composition courses have been drawing on a wider range of references than ever before as a result of the excitement-for-learning which has been stimulated by experiments in General Education. Maryland State Teachers College reported a very ambitious project to integrate the writing course with several of the other freshman courses, using American Studies as a core. The Moore Institute of Art (Philadelphia) reported an equally ambitious program relating literary and musical studies to their students' graphic and plastic studies. Temple University reported a program correlating work in the Humanities with that in Social Science; and a combined Music and Arts Course recommended for English majors. The most extensive program described was that of Boston University. There a core curriculum is required for the entire freshman and sophomore years at the College of General Education. The faculties of the various departments (English and Humanities, Social Studies, Physical Sciences) are in daily consultation, and the program is so arranged that information on psychology prepares students for

understanding modern literature; studies of American history prepare students for classic American novels; studies of scientific method prepare students for writing exercises in logic and semantics. Autobiographies written for Guidance Counsellors are prepared in collaboration with English instructors, etc. Instructors in all departments are concerned that papers are written in proper English style.

On the negative side, it was pointed out that the term General Education is the victim of false and inaccurate identification with the low-quality General Courses in high schools and teachers' colleges. For this reason (particularly in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware) integrated programs usually operate under some other name than that of General Education.

There was no agreement on the best kind of reading material to be used in a General Education writing course. Most felt that great works should be used (even in translations when first-rate translations are available). However, there were those who defended the book of essays as a bridge between the beginning student's *Readers' Digest* level and the level he should attain. Some felt that readings in a composition course should be used only as sources for ideas and that the study of literature should be handled separately. Brooklyn College reported a successful use of American and English literature of the twentieth century. Talladega College (Alabama) reported the extensive use of newspapers and magazines, while Temple University reported using great books from Sophocles to Orwell. At Boston University writing is required throughout both semesters of the sophomore year as well as through the freshman year. The average amount of writing required in all schools was 10 themes the first semester, and 5 themes plus a research paper the second semes-

ter. At the United States Air Force Academy, however, two themes a week are required (each writing instructor being limited to three classes of twelve students each).

The question of the relation of speech to reading and writing in a General Education course was a thorny problem. Most members agreed on its importance but felt that insufficient time was available for handling it properly, and that under present circumstances work with speech means that writing suffers. Staunchest support of speech came from the University of Illinois; there, not only speech, but "listening" seems to be treated as an academic subject.

The problem of minimum standards to be permitted in writing exists in General Education as elsewhere. At the University of Delaware, students who received a D in Freshman English or who are reported as deficient in writing ability *by any instructor in any department* are required to pass certain tests before they may graduate. At one school juniors must pass a proficiency test in English: if a man does not succeed in four trials he is not allowed to graduate. The pressure of this system has produced excellent and startling results: in the first year 179 failed, in the fourth year only 39. Pennsylvania State Teachers' College (Indiana) gives a similar test at the end of the sophomore year.

Several members stressed the need for nation-wide standards. The representative from the Bronx High School of Science spoke of the need for preparatory schools to have information on English standards, and the member from City College (New York) pointed out the direct relationship between increased enrollments and these standards. It was the general experience that neither presently used national placement tests, nor the New York Regents, nor high school grades were reliable indices to students' abilities. It was strongly felt that any

such test should include essays rather than merely "objective" questions. Strong and enthusiastic support was given to the work of Edgar Whan, Donald Tuttle, and H. J. Sachs as it was reported in the panel discussion on National Standards and Accreditation for Composition Courses. It was felt that this might well be the most effective work that the CCCC could pursue at this time.

Closely related to the problem of standards in writing was the problem of Remedial English. Here wide variation across the country was noted: some schools have dropped it, others have re-introduced it. One sure-fire way of arousing high schools and parents to their responsibilities is to require a paid-for non-credit course for deficient students. Variations of this are in operation at Ohio State, Delaware, and elsewhere. The University of Pittsburgh reported success with visits by members of the English department along with representatives from industry to the high schools in the Pittsburgh area. Kansas City Junior College (and several others) reported the success of high school and college articulation conferences. Attention was called to the *Illinois English Bulletin* (April, 1953) which shows relative standards used by high school and college teachers in grading themes; and it was suggested that college catalogs should be more specific about writing requirements. Workshop members agreed that blame for students' poor writing should not be directed at individual high school teachers but at some teachers colleges, school boards, and the philosophy of education now in control of most public elementary and secondary education.

The use of graduate students in General Education programs varied greatly. At Temple University sample-theme grading sessions are a way of helping new instructors; at Brooklyn College there is consultation with inexperienced

teachers; at Boston University's College of General Education graduate students are not used as teachers but do serve as supplementary theme graders on occasion. The situation at Indiana, where 92% of Freshman English teaching is done by graduate students, was universally deplored by all present. It was pointed out, in conclusion, that in view of the overwhelming importance of English composition and communication in the lives of students and citizens, the best possible teachers should be found and properly (financially) encouraged to make this their field of concentrated interest.

Chairman: Bill Read, Boston University, College of General Education

Co-Chairman: Abe Laufe, University of Pittsburgh

Secretary: Mable Worthington, Temple University, Philadelphia

Co-Secretary: John M. Gazda, Kansas City Junior College, Missouri

Resource: Michael Manheim, University of Delaware, Newark

Grace S. Nutley, Brooklyn College, New York
Stanley V. Baum, Temple University, Philadelphia

William J. Biel, Pennsylvania State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania

Marlene Fisher, Temple University, Philadelphia

Isabel S. Gordon, Bronx High School of Science, New York

Irwin Griggs, Temple University, Philadelphia

Sister Mary Inez Hanley, Mercy College, Detroit, Michigan

Joan Kerchensky, St. John's College, Annapolis

Donald E. McCoy, University of Illinois, Urbana

George McFadden, Temple University, Philadelphia

Margaret Montgomery, Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama

Peter Moody, U. S. Air Force Academy, Denver, Colorado

Burton Pollin, City College, New York City

Youra Qualls, Maryland State Teachers' College, Princess Anne

Margaret L. Ranald, Temple University, Philadelphia

Mother Austin Ronayne, Marymount College, Tarrytown, New York

William Rossky, Temple University, Philadelphia

Elliott K. Shapira, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

Mary-Grace Stewart, Moore Institute of Art, Philadelphia

Two-Session Workshops

1. *Administering the Large Freshman Program*

Five foci of discussion were suggested by Chairman Noonan in an outline he submitted for the workshop's activity: (1) Problems of Personnel; (2) Problems of Developing and Planning the Program and Selecting Texts; (3) Problems of Managing the Program; (4) New Trends in Freshman Composition Courses; and (5) Problems of Contact with Others. To provide something of a factual foundation for the second session Chairman Noonan distributed a questionnaire for each participant to complete.

The first personnel problem is that of the Director of Freshman English himself. Although the participants generally agreed that he needs special training—including more training in rhetoric, gen-

eral linguistics, and grammar than is contained in the normal doctoral program—they also agreed that in actuality the Director of Freshman English is chosen for personality and administrative capabilities rather than for any special training that he has. There was some feeling that the Director receives inadequate recognition in salary and rank advancements because conscientious attention to his duties precludes extensive literary research and publication. Most participants, however, agreed that the practical problems of increasing enrollments will compel increasing recognition of the Director.

The most pressing personnel problem the Director faces is that of maintaining reasonable uniformity in purposes and

standards in the freshman course among the different teachers. Suggestions for maintaining such reasonable uniformity included the following: (a) departmental grading of final theme or themes; (b) departmental tests; (c) departmental minimum standards; (d) frequent staff discussions of the freshman course; (e) indoctrination and close supervision of new staff members; (f) sample review of graded themes by Director or by Freshman Committee.

Whether the developing and planning of the freshman program is the responsibility of the whole staff or of a committee, the Director should have full authority and responsibility for the program. But only those members of the English department who regularly teach Freshman English should have any voice in the shaping of the course or in the formulation of policy for the guidance of the Director.

Discussion of Problems of Managing the Program concentrated on sectioning and returned to the problem of uniformity of theme-grading standards. All institutions represented by the participants except one use objective entrance tests, which prove reliable for gross segregation of students by ability, but not very reliable for assessing the abilities of the individual student. Consequently, most schools which section students by ability confirm sectioning with a sample of writing. Ten institutions represented by the participants have programs for remedial and superior students and have provisions for exemption from at least one term of Freshman English. Two of these institutions are planning to drop the remedial program.

Among the suggestions made for maintaining unity of theme-grading were the following: (a) staff grading of sample themes; (b) comparison of Freshman English grades with grades in other verbal skill courses; (c) periodic student grading of themes; (d) withholding of

grades on individual themes and assignment of cumulative writing grade late in term; (e) grading of in-class themes, marking only of out-of-class themes, with out-of-class writing used only to confirm in-class average; (f) committee grading of one or more sets of themes from each class during term.

The eighteen institutions represented in the completed questionnaires have an average of 1800 students in their freshman program, the smallest having 590 and the largest 3200. Composition class sizes in these institutions average 25 with one institution maintaining classes at 15 and another at 35. Full-time composition teachers in these institutions teach on the average 12 class hours per week, teaching loads ranging from 9 to 15 hours a week. Sixteen of the institutions have a permanent or rotating Director of Freshman English who is released an average of 33% from his other duties; however, two institutions give no relief from other duties for the Director while two others give as much as 66% relief. In half of the institutions all permanent staff members regularly teach freshman composition.

Only 7 institutions have a formal program for the indoctrination and training of inexperienced teachers. Writing requirements in freshman courses vary from 3,000 to 10,000 words per term, with an average requirement of 5,000 words per term.

It was the consensus of the workshop that the problems of administering the large freshman program will become increasingly aggravated and that the position of the Director of Freshman English will, in the larger institutions, have to become almost a full-time administrative position with part-time administrative assistants.

Chairman: John P. Noonan, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas
Co-Chairman: G. F. Horner, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Secretary: David H. Malone, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn

Co-Secretary: Leslie P. Bigelow, Arizona State College, Tempe

Resource: Joseph Schwartz, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Kenneth W. Houpp, Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Jack C. Barnes, University of Maryland, College Park

Newman P. Birk, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

Eugene J. Brzenk, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois

Carl A. Dallinger, State University of Iowa, Iowa City

Samuel J. Hazo, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

James R. Hodgins, Central Michigan College, Mt. Pleasant

Don A. Keister, University of Akron, Ohio

L. S. Lingenfelter, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania

Frank B. Moake, University of Illinois, Urbana

Kline A. Nall, Texas Technological College, Lubbock

Clarice E. Pierson, Texas Southern University, Houston

Selena B. Robinson, Virginia State College, Norfolk

Elizabeth H. Rusk, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Will R. Steinhoff, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Bain T. Stewart, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Eugene B. Vest, University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago

Orville F. White, Arkansas State College, State College

2. Introductory Discussion of Linguistics

Our participants were mainly freshman composition/communication teachers who were seeking to discover whether and how linguistic knowledge can be applied to their teaching so as to improve it. Many of them had attended such workshops before. They approved a two-fold agenda: a brief discussion of elementary linguistic materials by the workshop officers, and an attempt to apply this information to specific teaching problems.

First, Mr. Downer spoke on what linguistics is. He was led thereby into a consideration of language and basic assumptions about language which are fundamental to linguistic method, pointing out that the product of linguistic research is language descriptions. In the freshman course, Mr. Downer stated, the emphasis is properly on a socially superior dialect of Modern English. But writing is not language; it is a representation of language.

Mr. Chatham, after discussing the three-level hierarchical structure of English, developed the point further by contrasting the linguist and the rhetorician. As a descriptivist, the linguist is not concerned with value judgments, unlike the rhetorician, who is concerned because he teaches the prestige dialect, thus having province over matters in the teaching of

writing such as unity, coherence, and emphasis.

Mr. Finder then discussed the limitations of traditional grammar, as opposed to the values of linguistics. Through examples he demonstrated the inadequacy of traditional notions of traditional terms like *sentence*, *subject*, *predicate*, and designations for word classes like *nouns*, countering these with Henry Lee Smith's classifications based on a combination of inflectional, distributional, and stress criteria (from Smith's unpublished CCCC handout of March 1956).

At this point Mr. Austin briefly described the Trager-Smith transcription (from *An Outline of English Structure*, 1951), with explanations and blackboard illustrations of segmental and suprasegmental phonemes. He spoke of phonemes as the atoms of a language, and morphemes as the molecules.

Mr. Wetmore then explained the immediate constituent analysis of Paul Roberts (*Understanding English*, 1958). From his experience, Mr. Wetmore concluded that students are responsive to training in IC analysis, and that a sentence is structurally ambiguous and should be reconstructed if we are in doubt as to where certain IC cuts should be made.

In the discussions that followed, not much attention was paid to specific teaching problems. Some old questions were raised, receiving the old, sometimes unsatisfying answers. (1) For example, is the traditional terminology to be replaced by a new one based on a language analysis admittedly not yet complete? No, the traditional terms are not yet to be discarded as long as the teacher is able to give the student an enlightened understanding of the structure or attitude behind a given term. Anyway, terms in themselves may not be so important. (2) Must the teacher return to graduate school to learn linguistics? No, the major change should be in the teacher's orientation and point of view. And he can deepen his understanding through reading books such as Fries' *Structure of English*, Carroll's *Study of Language*, Hall's *Leave Your Language Alone*, and Bloomfield's and Sapir's *Language*, among others. Eventually, however, all new teachers should have a sound knowledge of descriptive and historical linguistics. (3) Even if a teacher has this knowledge, can he make it useful if his department uses the traditional grammarian's handbook? He *can*, through care. Linguistically oriented texts like those by Lloyd and Warfel, Roberts, and Nelson Francis are available, with others to follow—e.g., a handbook by Sumner Ives. Several participants remarked that their universities have adopted such a text, whereas some others reported that they had not

and possibly would not. (4) Should not meaning be used in linguistic analysis? No, for meaning is arrived at through structure, though it is not true that meaning is totally rejected in such analysis.

A question regarding the difference between speech and writing led to the challenging conclusion that a major problem in the teaching of writing is to get the student to construct unambiguous sentences, since pitches, stresses, and junctures can hardly appear in a student's theme. Another question elicited the view that the development of listening sensitivity accompanies linguistic training.

A last question brought the statement that perhaps summarized both sessions: one should have and should use linguistic knowledge when he teaches the freshman course, especially when it is applicable to grammatical problems, but he will do harm if he makes his classroom a training ground for junior linguists; moreover, the content of his course should probably contain more than English-language matters.

Chairman: Garland Cannon, University of Florida, Gainesville

Co-Chairman: James Downer, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Secretary: Morris Finder, Fenger High School, Chicago

Co-Secretary: Thomas Wetmore, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Resource: Seymour Chatman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
William Austin, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

(No roll of participants was taken)

3. *The Research Paper in the Freshman Course: A Reappraisal*

Some forty participants from fifteen states and the District of Columbia presented useful and provocatively divergent views on the place of the research paper in the Freshman English program. Among the lesser questions on which near-unanimity seemed to prevail was that this particular project might better be called a "source paper" or "investi-

gative paper" or simply "the long paper" rather than the more formidable "research" or "term" paper.

The first session began with a roll call of self-introductions, with each person stating one problem he very much wanted discussed. These problems ranged from "How long is a 'long paper'?" and "Should subjects chosen require a stu-

dent to take a position or defend a thesis?" to "How can this ambitious and notoriously unpopular assignment be effectively motivated?"

Discussion opened with the formulation of the case *against* the source paper: (a) Most of our present crop of freshmen just aren't up to it. How can Johnny be expected to prepare an orderly, well-reasoned, honest, properly documented essay of 2,000 words when he can't write a well-organized, reasonably correct 500-word essay? (b) The long-paper project consumes overmuch time, crowding out essential work on shorter themes, etc. (c) Often subjects for source papers go far afield, in areas unfamiliar to the instructor. (d) Plagiarism not uncommonly becomes a vexatious problem. (e) Library facilities in some institutions are inadequate, even when classes stagger this assignment. (f) The techniques emphasized—footnoting, outlining, bibliography, etc.—have little carry-over to other, advanced courses.

The case *for* the educative values and the practicability of the source paper came from many teachers: (a) The students have a disciplining and developmental experience in reasoning—in framing a thesis, in handling evidence, in posing hypotheses, in exploring subjects of larger scope and importance. (b) The long paper is a natural extension of shorter, less demanding papers—and is often useful in separating the superior student from the average. (We need today, as never before, to test and challenge our better students.) (c) Training in the use of the library resources is best secured by this assignment. (d) A "controlled source paper," relying on such text-collections of basic materials as E. C. Rozwenc's *New Deal: Revolution or Evolution?*² or Robert Weeks's *Commonwealth versus Sacco and Vanzetti* may be used where plagiarism or inadequate library facilities are prob-

lems. (d) Many resourceful teachers use preliminary impromptu, trial outlines, conferences, etc., to motivate, to guide, and to insure honest and self-reliant work.

A number of participants described experiences in particular subject areas where their own knowledge and interest helped to assure enthusiastic teaching: the Haymarket riots, by a Chicago instructor; the Civil War, by an instructor in the Northwest; biographical subjects, especially controversial political figures (preferably in an election year) or literary figures, by a Midwestern teacher; etc.

The evaluation of the finished paper came in for substantial and varied comment on matters ranging from the relative weight to be given to form and content, to the reliance on elaborate rating sheets. It was generally agreed, however, that instructors should certainly read these papers with particular care, add longer than usual terminal comments, and whenever possible arrange office conferences on them. This last obviously requires that papers be turned in earlier than the final weeks of the semester.

A valuable selected bibliography on teaching the research paper, prepared by Helena M. Smith, was distributed to workshop members, and the comprehensive bibliography included in Grewe and Sullivan's *The College Research Paper* was cited by the chairman. Both bibliographies include the excellent articles published in the *College Composition and Communication* in the past few years.

Despite the array of testimony against the source paper presented at the beginning of the sessions, the consensus of workshop members plainly favored its traditional place in Freshman English. And although the problem of how to teach it well remains difficult and perplexing, the large majority concluded the

disc
Not
Chai
Mi
Co-C
Ur
Secr
leg
Co-S
leg
Reso
leg
Hele
sit
Cole
tu
Eber
Pe
Will
leg
Viol
Ny
Chan
ing
Paul
tic
Robe
Yo
Marg
leg
Bro
Ph
Kath
Co
Ralp
tov
Euge
iga
Bern
Lo
Linn
Ta
Joan
Oh

T
at t
back
a di
This
ly. S
ing
thes
they
train
in t
lem
istra
offic
A la
sylla

discussion in the spirit of Clough's "Say Not the Struggle Nought Availeth."

Chairman: Carlton F. Wells, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Co-Chairman: John H. Reed, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware
Secretary: Robert A. Smith, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland
Co-Secretary: Mary Houston Davis, Finch College, New York City
Resource: Stewart S. Morgan, A. and M. College of Texas, College Station
 Helena M. Smith, Pennsylvania State University, University Park
 Coleman Arnold, Georgetown College, Kentucky
 Eben E. Bars, Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania
 William F. Belcher, North State Texas College, Denton
 Viola Bjorholm, Nyack Missionary College, Nyack-on-Hudson, New York
 Charles E. Blackburn, State College of Washington, Pullman
 Paul O. Clark, University of Hartford, Connecticut
 Robert W. Cumberland, The Cooper Union, New York City
 Margaret Dugger, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Brother G. Francis, F.S.C., LaSalle College, Philadelphia
 Kathryn I. Gordon, American International College, Springfield, Massachusetts
 Ralph S. Graber, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania
 Eugene F. Grewe, University of Detroit, Michigan
 Bernetta Jackson, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
 Linnie Keith, Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park, Maryland
 Joan Kerchensky, St. John College, Cleveland, Ohio

Robert G. Koch, Rochester Institute of Technology, New York
 Bernard A. Kogan, University of Illinois, Chicago
 Edith E. Layer, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio
 Sister Mary Aquin, O.P., Caldwell College, Caldwell, New Jersey
 Sister Mary Charles, Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pennsylvania
 Sister Mary Ellen, I.H.M., Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pennsylvania
 Margaret McCullough, Lansdowne-Aldon High School, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania
 William McDonald, University of Toledo, Ohio
 James W. McKay, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
 Ben Morrow, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Dorothy E. Moulton, Bowling Green State University, Ohio
 Isabel K. Patterson, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
 James Randall, Boston University, Boston
 George W. Reisinger, State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania
 Harold G. Ridlon, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts
 Mother Austin Ronayne, Marymount College, Tarrytown, New York
 Ruby T. Scott, University of Toledo, Ohio
 Edith Stone, Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park, Maryland
 Edward Stone, Ohio University, Athens
 Eleanor W. Traylor, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
 Helen H. Turner, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus
 Donald R. Tuttle, Fenn College, Cleveland, Ohio
 J. R. Walden, D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, Massachusetts
 Charles M. Waters, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee
 Cecil B. Williams, Oklahoma A. & M. University, Stillwater

4. *The Course Syllabus: Preparation, Content, Use*

The members of CCCC who gathered at this workshop came with a variety of backgrounds in syllabus-making and with a diverse set of interests in the problem. This diversity revealed itself very quickly. Some had had no experience in making up or using syllabi in their teaching; these were interested primarily because they foresaw course expansion and the training of new instructors. At least one in this category faced the syllabus problem for the first time because the administration of the college and accreditation officials wanted a measure for the course. A larger group had experience in using syllabi in the freshman course, but this

group split into parts, some of whom used syllabi for instructors only, others for students and instructors.

Two other differences were revealed. One was that the size of the school had great effect on the type of syllabus prepared. Some participants were preparing syllabi for 50 to 125 sections, many of which were being taught by graduate assistants; others were devising syllabi for use in just a few sections, with meetings of instructors to provide background and supplement the syllabus so that completeness and full detail were not major problems. The difference in number of sections and the experience of the in-

structors teaching them had an influence also on the flexibility of the syllabus. A rigid syllabus was decided to be most useful to help and guide new instructors and to give focus and uniformity to the course. On the other hand, too great rigidity, it was recognized, could defeat more experienced teachers and hamper the creativity of younger men. It was also recognized that the syllabus form had to be tailored to the specific situation in the college or university. A brief survey of participants showed that they were equally divided into three groups of schools—those which had under 10 sections of freshman composition, between 10 and 30 sections, and more than 30 sections.

From the time that this variety of interest and point of view became apparent, participants realized that the most effective use of discussion could come from a simple exchange of experiences in syllabus-making. Many approaches were described. One, for instance, was a situation in which three separate syllabi were worked out to comply with the ideas of different instructors. When other participants wondered whether objections to this procedure might be made by outsiders on the grounds that not one but three courses were being offered, the speaker pointed out that this objection simply had not been made.

A second approach was an attempt not only to prepare a syllabus but also to include some measure of the goals aimed at in the material covered in a unit in the course. There was strong agreement among participants that this practice was helpful to instructors and would be helpful to students. Still a third attempt, one participant recounted, led to an unfortunate experience when a syllabus was distributed to students which indicated a day-by-day chart of materials to be covered and assignments to be made, an experience not to be repeated because it

upset students extremely if an instructor varied his practice at all from the "written law" of the syllabus.

Out of other questions, a view of the function of the syllabus emerged that was new to many participants. This was a view of the syllabus as a means of presenting freshman composition to others outside the course and to helping non-composition instructors to see what is in the course. Thus a syllabus can perform the service of helping instructors in advanced courses, to build upon and integrate their teaching with the freshman course.

Questions arose that were vital and important though not strictly related to the syllabus-making itself. One such question was the relation between writing, reading, and speaking in a composition course; another, the degree to which subject matter of other courses taken by the student should be made the subject matter of freshman composition; a third, the extent to which the reading that is used as subject matter of course writing should be limited to one type (essays, novels, etc.), or whether reading should be used at all.

The advantages of the workshop lay chiefly in the presentation of different ideas and points of view by the participants; consequently, benefits are hard to generalize. It would be safe to say, however, that all participants heard discussed approaches to syllabus-making that they personally had not thought of before and that many came away with ideas which they would attempt to put into operation in future syllabus-making.

Chairman: John A. Hart, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh
Co-Chairman: Alan B. Howes, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Secretary: Morrison Brown, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Co-Secretary: Richard Bozorth, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
Resource: Marjorie Smiley, Hunter College, New York City

John
 Po
 John
 Mary
 leg
 Regi
 log
 Richa
 sylv
 Ralph
 Ve
 Willi
 Ar
 Loren
 sti
 J. L.
 Marr
 Ha

T
 wor
 go.
 eme
 chie
 ance
 ing
 the
 ion
 the
 conc
 had
 exan
 ards
 of th
 wor
 D
 cont
 of I
 ber
 the
 rem
 so s
 term
 curi
 stitu
 from
 priv
 saw

John H. Chitty, U. S. Military Academy, West Point

John M. Coulson, LaSalle College, Philadelphia

Mary Elizabeth Cox, West Liberty State College, West Virginia

Reginald D. Forbes, National Agricultural College, Doyalstown, Pennsylvania

Richard B. Geger, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania

Ralph E. Hawes, Castleton Teachers College, Vermont

William M. Jones, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Lorena Kemp, West Virginia State College, Institute

J. L. Kendall, University of Oklahoma, Norman

Marretta P. King, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania

Harry P. Kroiter, University of Buffalo, New York

Eleanor Lane, Arkansas State College, State College

Alfred E. Leja, Concordia College, Austin, Texas

Roy L. Mitchell, Mohawk Valley Tech. Inst., Utica, New York

Josephine G. Rickard, Houghton College, New York

Cora D. Updyke, Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York

Lila Villa, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania

Mother Walsh, Marymount Junior College, Arlington, Virginia

Margaret Woodbridge, Millersville State Teachers College, Pennsylvania

Michael Yatron, Delaware State College, Dover

5. *Maintaining Standards in Spite of Rising Enrollments*

This workshop stemmed from two workshops of the 1957 meeting in Chicago. Out of Workshop 15b there had emerged an awareness that one of the chief pressures threatening the maintenance of standards is the rapidly increasing number of students crowding into the colleges and universities. Discussion of this problem was the purpose of the new Workshop 5. In like manner, one conclusion of Workshop 17b in Chicago had been that more time was needed to examine the problems of national standards for composition. Many participants of that workshop were active in this new workshop in Philadelphia.

Discussion early centered upon the controversial topic of remedial sections of Freshman English. Although a number of institutions, following the lead of the University of Illinois, have dropped remedial courses or contemplate doing so soon, there seemed to be no clear pattern across the country. The Illinois plan curiously appealed more to the state institutions that must accept all graduates from state high schools than it did to private institutions. The state institutions saw the dropping of remedial English as

a means of exerting a healthy pressure upon high schools to upgrade the standards of their composition work. Perhaps the private institutions felt less obligation to the high schools. At any rate, they felt a strong obligation to the students they had accepted by a fairly selective entrance system. If a student had been given the encouragement that acceptance to college implied, then the institution felt morally obliged to give him a fair chance to make up deficiencies in his background. All agreed, however, that even if a student were given the second chance that remedial English provided, that should be the last chance. Something as stringent as an "up-or-out" policy regarding remedial work expressed the sentiment of the group.

Much attention was also given to the problem of who will teach English in the period of rising enrollments. Half of the problem was seen to be the maintenance of present staff level. Merely to stay even, it will be necessary to recruit new staff members while fighting off raids upon top talent by institutions that can offer higher salaries. Also an old bugaboo of post-World War II days seems to be ap-

pearing again; the staff may be filled by available housewives and retired ministers on the grounds that "anyone can teach English, can't they?" Already increased enrollment at state universities has had an adverse effect on the teaching staff. The time when most graduate students hired as teaching assistants were M.A.'s seems to have past. A large percentage now are fresh B.A.'s starting work on the masters' degree.

The other half of the staff problem was the attempt to raise standards rather than merely stand still. Frequent staff meetings, attempts at grading standards, professional incentives for growth were all pointed to as the first session closed. It was agreed that the second session would address itself to teaching conditions and means of maintaining standards.

Since conditions are far from ideal in most institutions now, there was a fear that increased enrollment might mean deterioration from even present standards. A poll of the group showed that most composition teachers carry a load of 12 hours with 25-30 students per section. (Extremes were 15 hours with 30 students and 9 hours with 20 students.) Some relief from paper work seemed likely from an increased use of mechanical aids, such as the opaque projector, the overhead projector, special film strips.

A more amorphous part of the teaching conditions, but more vital, is the atmosphere in which the teacher of composition works. In spite of the effective work of the CCCC, the composition teacher is still a second citizen in most departments. Worse than this, he feels himself inferior. Too often he entered teaching because of a love of literature and a vague feeling that a professor of English spends his life sitting in a study reading his favorite books. In graduate school he learned that teaching composition is a form of torture reserved for apprentice teachers. As quickly as possible he hopes to escape upward into lit.

courses and join the ranks of the aristocrats, the literary scholars. A change in this climate is essential; fortunately there are signs of a change for the better. A first stage has already been reached in which composition is recognized as the "essential," the "most important" work of a department. But, so far, this is mostly lip service. The second stage will be the wide acceptance of the fact that composition is a field of study and research, a legitimate area of scholarship.

The workshop ended with a discussion of practical procedures in meeting the threats to standards. On the local level, composition teachers must resist the blandishments of their colleagues in the professional schools who demand "more English" but would define English as Writing 1-2. The English department must never yield control of how the aims of fine and competent composition are to be achieved, for then English will dwindle into a service course. The sights have to be kept high; the discipline of language and literature must not be sold out. On the national level, two approaches were suggested. One is to seek a really effective test of composition. There was serious doubt whether an objective test such as the widely popular Cooperative English Test does the job. Two is to establish national standards for composition teaching and make these effective through existing organizations. With active interest in the possibilities of some system of self-evaluation of composition programs, the workshop adjourned to attend Panel V which discussed this topic.

Chairman: Donald A. Sears, Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey

Co-Chairman: John Hicks, Stetson University, DeLand, Florida

Secretary: Elizabeth Rose, New York University, New York City

Co-Secretary: Lucille Clifton, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

Resource: Harris W. Wilson, University of Illinois, Urbana

Clarence Derrick, University of Florida, Gainesville

Sister Ann Edward, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia

Meta
Ke
Ruth
Ke
Nick
mo
Rev.
vill
Glad
dep
Edwi
Ga
Rayn
Robe
sit

A
gran
wor
essa
teste
que
own
beca
posi
to b
wer
ed
con
boo
dity
of s

T
first
chie
whi
Wh
sen
set
and
bes
tain

T
day
tho
con
the
the
cou
pos
and
ing

Meta Riley Emberger, University of Louisville, Kentucky
 Ruth V. Furniss, Louisville Public Schools, Kentucky
 Nick Aaron Ford, Morgan State College, Baltimore
 Rev. Charles V. Hayes, Siena College, Londonville, New York
 Gladys T. Jackson, Talladega College, Talladega, Alabama
 Edwin C. Kirkland, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Raymund L. Levy, University of Toledo, Ohio
 Robert H. Moore, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Brother Pius, St. Mary's College, Winona, Minnesota
 Harold Ridlon, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts
 H. J. Sachs, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston
 W. B. Schneider, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Myles Slatin, University of Buffalo, New York
 Helen Throckmorton, University of Wichita, Kansas
 James E. Yockel, Rochester Institute of Technology, New York

6. *The Freshman Anthology: Its Virtues and Shortcomings*

Although the title in the official program was as above, this two-session workshop kept its focus on the prevalent essay anthology. In spite of known and tested virtues, this type of book has frequently been criticized, sometimes for its own character and sometimes perhaps because it represented a freshman composition course so narrowly utilitarian as to be self-defeating. Workshop members were given, for a springboard, duplicated sheets containing a dozen pairs of contrary opinions about this kind of textbook, some of them dealing with its validity as a type and some with problems of selection and editing.

The basic questions agreed to for the first meeting were these: what are the chief aims of the freshman course in which the anthology is commonly used? What purposes, therefore, must the chosen reading serve? Questions tentatively set for the second meeting: for such aims and purposes, is the essay anthology the best choice? If so, what should it contain, and how should it be edited?

The answers proposed for the first day's questions will startle no one, though the group took some pleasant conversational by-paths in arriving at them. Nearly all assumed composition as the determining activity of the freshman course. The reading should furnish expository prose that can be used for model and illustration, and sometimes for training in comprehension. It should have sub-

stance and interest, but (except in the special case of the controlled source paper) the reading should not be chosen to furnish information for the student to put directly into his compositions. Instead, it should make the student aware of his own mental resources, should arouse him mentally to the point of being eager to write and to develop his own partially formed ideas. This reflects, of course, the ever-present problem in composition: what shall the student write about?

Along the way, numerous points were at issue, only a few of which can be mentioned.

To what extent is the student reading for content and ideas for their own sake? It was pointed out that in proceeding through an anthology, the teacher often feels that his course lacks unity and coherence in subject matter, and that he presides over the discussion of subjects he is not a master of. (This is not necessarily bad, someone else replied.) If language or communication is taken as the central subject, much of the material may not be sufficiently good writing in itself.

The user (or the maker) of an anthology may be faced with a piece of work that is gracefully written but thin and lacking in ideas. There was a vigorous reminder that he is quite as likely to meet a work containing notable ideas badly expressed.

What balance ought to be struck between contemporary works and those in the idiom of an earlier century, such as the nineteenth?

On all these questions, there were divergent opinions.

The second day began with the question whether the essay anthology is the proper choice. Why not study the use of language in poetry? What about fiction? Opinion was divided. It was observed that the choice of reading might be affected by the kind of curriculum the freshman course is a part of.

Alternatives to the anthology? Use of current magazines offers the difficulty that the teacher cannot plan what is to come. Paperback books are favored by some; others feel that exclusive use of paperbacks does not give students sufficient respect for or pleasure in books. Nevertheless, it was remarked, reading a well-chosen book, a classic, might be a luminous experience and more memorable for the student than the reading of a series of essays.

The critical tone of some recent articles (for example, in *College English*, November, 1956, and May, 1957) might lead one to suppose that there is considerable discontent either with the quality or current collections or with the practice of using anthologies instead of separate books. Such discontent was not much in evidence in this group, which included experienced users and experienced editors of anthologies. Obviously the problems of freshman reading will not be solved in any one way.

As to the editing of the anthology, the group seemed to consider teaching aids desirable; there was a good deal of sen-

timent for the practice of supplying such help in a separately printed manual.

An editor from a publishing house jested that he was heartened by the variety of opinion he had heard—whatever type of book he might put out would find favor somewhere.

Chairman: Keith Hollingsworth, Wayne State University, Detroit
Co-Chairman: Wallace W. Douglas, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Secretary: Bruce R. Park, Brooklyn College
Co-Secretary: George C. McElroy, Indiana University, Gary Center
Resource: John Gerber, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 Edwin R. Clapp, University of Utah, Salt Lake City
 Richard S. Beal, Boston University
 Paul M. Bechtel, Wheaton College, Illinois
 Irving D. Blum, University of Illinois, Chicago
 Norman Charles, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania
 Karl W. Dykema, Youngstown University, Ohio
 Ernest Earnest, Temple University, Philadelphia
 Frances R. Ekins, Scott, Foresman Company
 Kathryn Gordon, American International College, Springfield, Massachusetts
 Samuel J. Hazo, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh
 Seymour Lainoff, Yeshiva College, New York City
 L. S. Lingenfelter, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania
 Louis G. Locke, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
 George A. Middendorf, Harper and Bros.
 George A. Peck, Brooklyn College
 Walter G. Prausnitz, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota
 Susan Rusinko, West Liberty State College, West Virginia
 Sister Mary Modesta, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania
 James S. Smoot, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania
 Jane W. Stedman, Roosevelt University, Chicago
 Jess Stein, Random House
 George D. Stout, Washington University, St. Louis
 Howard P. Vincent, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago
 Ronald A. Wells, U. S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut
 Samuel K. Workman, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago

7. *Rhetorical Invention: Finding Good Subject Matter for Student Compositions*

The chairman called the first session of Workshop 7 to order, presented the workshop officers, and then called for introductions from each member of the

group.

Mr. P. J. Aldus, co-chairman, was invited to initiate the discussion by stating some of the problems involved. Mr. Al-

dus prov
time
Five
ial w
essay
of li
ma,
or re
tions
teach

Mr.
Penn
comm
devic
expo

Mr.
vesti
Kent
make
nity
isfied

Lu
tione
Colle
tion.
whic
any
woul
dent
with

Af
tions
and
noon
there
rhet
some
writi
was p
begin
speci
ter in

Mr.
of th
co-ch
Stew
in th

dus posed this problem: How can we provide a body of material at the same time that we teach the skills of writing? Five possible sources for student material were mentioned: (1) anthologies of essays; (2) anthologies based on bodies of literature (short stories, poetry, drama, essays); (3) outside reading sources or requirements; (4) magazine subscriptions (*Harpers, Atlantic*, etc.); (5) The teacher as a stimulus.

Mr. Freniere then told of a project at Penn State where students investigate community conditions largely through the device of personal interviews and write expository reports on their findings.

Mr. Hatch pointed to a successful investigative project at the University of Kentucky which requires the student to make an informal survey of the community to determine if the citizens are satisfied in their occupations.

Lurene Brown of Ohio University mentioned an article she has written for the *College Composition and Communication*. Her article will present a project in which the student is asked to investigate any personal problem about which he would like more information. The student then follows up this investigation with a paper.

After several miscellaneous suggestions from the participants, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Hodges concluded the afternoon's discussion by observing that there seemed to be two approaches to the rhetorical problem in the workshop: some members were speaking for report writing, some for evaluative writing. It was proposed that the next session might begin at this point and enumerate some specific proposals for good subject matter in student compositions.

Mr. Hodges opened the second session of the workshop by asking Mr. Aldus, co-chairman, to summarize the Randall Stewart article that had been mentioned in the earlier discussion. The article in

question, "The Freshman Course Needs Ideas," appeared in the October, 1955, issue of *College English*. Mr. Aldus explained that the thesis of the article is that the freshman students need to acquire ideas through reading literature. Discussion sessions would grow out of the books read; papers would then evolve from the discussions. Mr. Aldus described a similar program which had been instituted at Ripon College. This program at Ripon has been provocative and has given students a body of ideas.

Further ideas for getting students to write were then elicited by the chairman. Mr. Bradshaw said that at the University of Florida most of the writing grew out of the discussion sessions. One of the first papers at Florida is an autobiography or biography. (Mr. Bradshaw felt there were advantages in using the third person approach—that this presented more objectivity.) Other assignments revolved around a types or ideas approach. Process papers, description, narration, various forms of exposition were involved.

Mr. Sullivan raised the question of rhetorical invention in scientific writing. Can reportorial writing be inventive or rhetorical? He felt that it could and pointed to British scientific writing as an example of rhetorical invention in the scientific report. Mr. Sullivan suggested that perhaps the best reportorial writing does have invention, that reportorial writers need training in rhetoric.

Mr. Aldus then brought up the question of the kind and quality of apparatus in rhetoric texts. Should the apparatus be used? Was there too much apparatus in most current texts? Most members of the workshop thought the apparatus could be helpful or a hindrance, and that used with circumspection it was probably of some value. All tended to think that some of the apparatus material was overdone. Mr. Sullivan thought such apparatus might better be placed in a

teacher's manual rather than in the textbook itself.

Mr. Hatch then suggested that the student should write from his immediate campus experience. For example, he cited the use of abstract paintings in the college art gallery as a stimulus for student writing. He suggested, too, that the moving picture could serve as a source for subject matter. He thought an examination of local newspapers could be still another source of subject matter. Books in the library are another source easy to come by.

Another participant suggested that the annual *Look Magazine* list of one hundred most important persons in the world could serve as a stimulus for writing. Have the students protest some of the choices or agree or add to the list. Mr. Sullivan told of an experiment where he had students contrast buildings in relation to the society that created them. Papers should move in meanings from the literal to the symbolic to the moral and transcendental levels. Essays might be chosen to point this out.

Mr. Hodges brought the workshop to a conclusion by suggesting five broad areas that had been touched on in dealing with the problem of rhetorical invention: interviews, readings, evaluations, speculation, and interpretation. Mr.

Hodges voiced the consensus of the group in noting that we had started to approach specific solutions to the assigned topic when the workshop session ended.

Chairman: James R. Hodges, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
Co-Chairman: P. J. Aldus, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin
Secretary: Warren I. Titus, George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee
Co-Secretary: Marie Woodard, Temple University, Philadelphia
Resource: Philip Bradshaw, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Paul R. Sullivan, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
 Frank S. Baker, Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana
 Lurene C. Brown, Ohio University, Athens
 Sister M. Consilia, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania
 Mrs. Lucile P. Folk, Louisiana Tech, Ruston
 Emil Freniere, Pennsylvania State University, University Park
 Ruth M. Harris, State Teachers College, Edinboro, Pennsylvania
 Maurice A. Hatch, University of Kentucky, Lexington
 Christian B. Hewitt, Altoona Center, Pennsylvania State University
 Ralph T. Lindeman, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania
 Sister St. Magdalen, S.S.J., Hollohan High School, Philadelphia
 Sister M. Rita Margaret, O. P., Caldwell College, Caldwell, New Jersey
 Sister Joseph Maria, S.S.J., Hollohan High School, Philadelphia
 John A. Penrod, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Margaret L. Ranald, Temple University, Philadelphia
 John Rees, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
 Wanda G. Walker, Arkansas State College, State College
 June Yaros, Temple University, Philadelphia

8. *The Uses of Logic in the Freshman Course*

Historically, Robert Russell noted in introduction, logic was part of the trivium of Grammar, Logic, and Rhetoric. Logic has largely been dropped from the trivium, and emphasis upon important but less fundamental problems of mechanics and usage has led to the neglect of content. Defective content is all too commonly a product of defective logic. Unless students and teachers share a common vocabulary of elementary logical terms and an understanding of basic logical errors, it is difficult to mark

themes meaningfully. Failure in logic is such a common weakness that it deserves all the attention it can be given. Beginning writers have difficulty in developing their thoughts, and unless they understand the logical development of an idea they tend to repeat themselves and pad their writing. A study of logic demonstrates the effective use of data, premises, and conclusions from which the pattern of the theme emerges. Understanding the syllogism, for example, can train the student to find the beginning of

his thought processes, and from this point the student can develop his argument to an effective conclusion.

The assumption that logic can not be avoided in the freshman course gained unanimous assent, but the question of what kind of logic, how much of it, and when it should be taught generated considerable discussion. Some questioned the emphasis on the categorical syllogism, recommended the introduction of symbolic logic, and argued that an analysis of inductive patterns of logic was more directly relevant to writing problems. Traditional formal analysis probably should be preceded by analysis of the more commonly employed forms of inductive logic.

The supporters, however, of the use of a rather full traditional terminology defended extensive analysis of the syllogism by suggesting that whole themes or speeches can be based on the structure of the syllogism and that time spent on formal analysis of the syllogism is repaid in increased unity and coherence of the theme. Most participants still felt, however, that (a) logical terminology should be kept to a minimum, and (b) it is better to place greater stress on inductive logic.

The group recognized that emphasis on logic is not a popular approach to the teaching of composition. Some were concerned with ways of convincing doubtful colleagues of the value of the logical approach. The basic answer to such doubts was that logic was essential to nearly all forms of effective writing whether it be called creative, expository, critical, analytical, or descriptive. Several added that logical analysis of the selections in anthologies was an effective way of teaching organization and effective argumentative structure. More specifically, logic could help the student: (1) recognize fact and opinion, (2) deal with abstract terms, (3) organize and develop

research, (4) understand the function and techniques of mass media, (5) relate his studies to science, and (6) give him analytical techniques to sharpen his understanding and appreciation of literature.

The group generally agreed that inductive logic was necessary in the freshman course and that it might have more application in the classroom without being taught only for its own sake. The group did not generally agree on the value of the syllogism if study became too formal or too technical. It inherently has the same dangers as study of formal grammar in the freshman course. Practice within the group varied from setting aside five hours in the course for actual study of logic to eighteen hours. A slight majority favored stressing logic throughout the course to isolating it as an independent unit. Nobody in the group had found a textbook to satisfy him; this dissatisfaction led to much instructor-prepared material.

Chairman: T. J. Kallsen, Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches, Texas

Co-Chairman: Robert Russell, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Secretary: Virgil L. Lokke, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

Co-Secretary: Robert U. Jameson, Haverford School, Pennsylvania

Resource: Robert O'Hara, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Dudley Bailey, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Elizabeth B. Brown, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia

Sister Ann Edward, Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia

Robert E. Gajdeisel, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

John R. Kirk, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Jacob Korg, University of Washington, Seattle

Frederick M. Link, Boston University

I. S. Locker, Gettysburg College

Robert C. Lugton, Teacher's College, Columbia, University, New York City

Sister James Marie, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

Margaret Y. Miki, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Maryland

Carol Oppenheimer, Scott Foresman, Chicago

Richard Staney, The City College, New York

James E. Yockel, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York

9. *The Philosophy of the Communication Course*

Brief statements of the philosophies of four representative communication courses or programs prepared by Ted J. Kallsen (Stephen F. Austin State College), Harold B. Allen (University of Minnesota), Donald E. McCoy (University of Illinois), and Carl A. Dallinger (State University of Iowa) provided the basis of discussion for this workshop. There was common agreement that the study of communication, based upon the reciprocal relationships of the writer and reader(s), speaker and listener(s), is the principle around which instruction in such courses should be integrated. Although there are some differences between writing, speaking, reading, and listening, the common elements in these aspects of communication are sufficient to make instruction on an integral basis more economical and meaningful than in separate courses in each of these skills. In actuality they are integrated in the functioning of communication in society.

Discussion in the workshop centered upon what should be the proper core of content for such courses. The point of view represented by Kallsen saw several possible "cores" or blends of them: general semantics, linguistics, or the communication process itself. "Both theory and practice of communication as a process," an obligation to "truth," knowledge and proper use of the "conventions of communication" are emphasized in this approach.

"Socially significant communication is largely linguistic communication" was the keynote of Harold Allen's philosophy. In courses with this point of orientation . . . students not only study the use of language to communicate but also write about it and speak about it . . . If the freshman is to become linguistically less naive than when he left high school," Allen contended, "the communication course cannot ethically afford to devote precious class time or study time to such

irrelevant materials as the models of 'thought-stimulating' essays of the typical freshman essay collections or to other content that rightfully belongs in other courses."

In addition to a closely integrated study and practice of the four skills, Donald McCoy projected "that the proper emphasis of a college-level course in communication is that of practical communication in society." Consistent with this philosophy, emphasis in the second semester of the course at the University of Illinois is on " . . . a problem-solving experience in deliberation; . . . all reading, writing, speaking, and listening exercises during the second semester derive in one way or another from the central deliberative experience," based upon the thorough study of " . . . some currently unsolved question of public policy . . ." Concern is not with the development of professional writers and speakers but with the requirements and responsibilities both as a communicator and a receptor of " . . . any educated member of an American community."

Rhetorical principles constitute the "core" of the Communication Skills Program at the State University of Iowa. Centering instruction in theory on these principles, adequate provision is made for the student to apply these principles in writing, reading, speaking, and listening experiences. This course rests on the assumption that the ability to read, write, speak, and listen adequately, intelligently, without reluctance, and with discrimination is basic equipment of an educated person. This philosophy maintains that the study of rhetorical principles stems out of a long tradition and constitutes a respectable core of content, a discipline which is pursued even at the graduate level.

Readings in various literary types, logic, emphasis on propaganda analysis were also presented as central points of

orien
ment
the "
cours
prese
a po
circu
unive

Chair
of I
Co-Ch
Min
Secret
Col
Resou
Sta
Donal
na
Howa
Gua
Harol
Herbe
Min
Eloise

10.

Th
tation
dure
This
sent
shop
Com
Fifty
fifty
use c
ation
were
ratin
only
evalu
staff
syste
are n
cers
porta
prom
Di
ent
The
"How
impr
tems

orientation in other programs. No agreement was reached as to what should be the "core of content" in communication courses or programs, each point of view presented in the discussion standing as a possible approach, depending on the circumstances at a particular college or university.

Chairman: Carl A. Dallinger, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
Co-Chairman: Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Secretary: Rhodes R. Stabley, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Resource: T. J. Kallsen, Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches, Texas
 Donald E. McCoy, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Howard N. Bernsten, United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut
 Harold M. Carr, Boston University
 Herbert L. Carson, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
 Eloise N. Courter, State University of New

York Institute, Canton
 Earnest Faust, State Teachers College, Kutztown, Pennsylvania
 John Fisher, Goshen College, Indiana
 R. D. Forbes, National Agricultural College, Doylestown, Pennsylvania
 Richard Gill, Pace College, New York City
 Alden B. Hanson, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
 Dorothy E. Harpster, State Teachers College, California, Pennsylvania
 Fr. Charles V. Hayes, Siena College, Loudonville, New York
 John Hicks, John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Florida
 Raymona Hull, State University of New York, Canton
 Leo H. Le Maire, Pace College, New York City
 L. S. Lingenfelter, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pennsylvania
 Sister Mary Phillipa, Mercyhurst College, Erie, Pennsylvania
 John Rees, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
 Mother Austin Ronayne, Marymount College, Tarrytown, New York
 Lilia Villa, Allegheny College, Pennsylvania
 O. F. White, Arkansas State College, Jonesboro

10. *Determining the Quality of Composition/Communication Teaching*

The workshop opened with the presentation of a report on evaluation procedures prepared by Herman A. Estrin. This report was based on a questionnaire sent to participants in the 1957 workshop on "Determining the Quality of Composition/Communication Teaching." Fifty answers were obtained. Of these fifty somewhat more than half reported use of some systematic method of evaluation. The two most used techniques were reported as student evaluation by rating scale or essay (generally available only to the instructor concerned) and evaluation based on class visits by senior staff members. In those institutions using systematic evaluation where the results are made available to administrative officers the evaluation results are an important factor in determining retention, promotion, and salary increases.

Discussion of the report and of pertinent questions arising from it followed. The discussion centered in the question, "How does systematic evaluation help to improve instruction?" A number of systems of evaluation were described, in-

cluding elaborate systems of rating scales; systematic class visiting by senior staff members, followed by conferences; study of student progress by examination of themes early and late in the year by experienced instructors; frequent conferences to establish grading standards; and student evaluation of various kinds.

Eloquent presentations of the desirability of class visits were made by Mr. Steinhoff (Michigan) and Mr. Hatch (Kentucky). Both speakers emphasized that the status of composition teachers (and indeed all teacher) depends in large part on their willingness to have their work examined and that this can be done most effectively by class visits. Both also emphasized that the success of an evaluation procedure based on class visits depends on establishing among the instructors to be examined a conviction that the function of the visits is to help, not to spy, and that, as apprentices, beginning teachers must expect and should welcome sympathetic inspection of their work. It was also said that reports of

class visits and of the conferences following them should be made available to administrative officers as a help in deciding on retention, promotion, and granting tenure.

As a result of the discussion fairly general—though by no means unanimous—agreement was reached that (1) formal rating scales are not a desirable method of evaluation (2) student evaluation may be useful to the instructor evaluated but is probably too uncertain to be used by administrators (3) that a large department with a considerable number of new teaching fellows, graduate assistants, and instructors each year must of necessity establish an evaluation system, probably based on class visits and administered by experienced staff members who are granted released time for the work. It was also generally agreed that a desirable, even necessary adjunct to a system of evaluation is a seminar on teaching required of all graduate assistants and teaching fellows and granting credit towards graduate degrees.

It was remarked that such a program would not be possible for small departments with a turnover or addition of, say, from one to five people a year. Many of the participants in the workshop thought that the intimate contact among senior and junior members of such departments made any systematic evaluation unnecessary. But also it was pointed out that in some institutions some sort of formal evaluation is required for granting tenure and promotion even though small numbers are involved. The suggestion was made that a college-wide committee to evaluate young instructors might be a solution.

Finally, it was agreed that since the function of evaluation is to improve teaching standards both by eliminating instructors whose chances for success are small and by helping potentially good instructors to realize their potential, the

workshop should recommend that a statement regarding evaluation be included in any policy statement issued by the Committee on Standards and Accreditation of the CCCC.

And it was further agreed to recommend to the CCCC that a panel discussion of techniques for improving the teaching of new instructors be included in the 1959 meeting.

Chairman: Ernest W. Gray, University of Toledo, Ohio

Co-Chairman: Herman A. Estrin, Newark College of Engineering, New Jersey

Secretary: Benjamin F. Gronewold, State University of New York, Buffalo

Co-Secretary: Dorothy E. Moulton, Bowling Green State University, Ohio

Resource: Jack L. Kendall, University of Oklahoma, Norman

William R. Steinhoff, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Mary Elizabeth Cox, West Liberty State College, West Virginia

Dudley Ferris, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York

Nick Aaron Ford, Morgan State College, Baltimore

Richard B. Geyer, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania

Walker Gibson, New York University, New York City

Eugene F. Grewe, University of Detroit, Michigan

Maurice A. Hatch, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Keith Hollingsworth, Wayne State University, Detroit

George F. Horner, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Raymona Hull, State University of New York, Canton

Selena B. Johnson, Virginia State College, Norfolk

William M. Jones, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Robert Koch, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York

Raymond L. Levy, University of Toledo, Ohio

Sister M. Rita Margaret, O.P., Caldwell College, New Jersey

W. A. McBrien, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York

H. J. Sachs, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston

Herbert M. Schueller, Wayne State University, Detroit

Bain T. Stewart, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Orville F. White, Arkansas State College, Jonesboro

11. *The Rhetoric of the Paragraph: Principles and Practices*

The group agreed that the discussion pattern should begin with the rhetoric of the paragraph in general and then proceed to the more particular aspects of teaching paragraph writing. The first question presented was, "How adequate, from both theoretical and practical viewpoints, are contemporary definitions of the paragraph?" Some felt that because of modern usage, a definition of the paragraph is little benefit. Others declared that each student should induce his own definition; he should begin by analyzing both his own writing and the work of professional writers and progress to an understanding of just what a paragraph is and what function it performs in the whole paper. In general, however, the workshop gave somewhat favorable attention to definitions emphasizing that the paragraph is not an isolated unit of thought, but is part of a larger structure, a larger content, and even a larger rhythm. The general feeling regarding the definition of the paragraph seemed to be expressed by Mr. Jerome Fischer who remarked that if something is taught and learned, definition is feasible, but it is "useless to belabor definition."

The group next discussed the question, "How adequate are the terms *unity*, *coherence*, and *emphasis*?" Mrs. Ilse D. Lind sketched the growth of the concept of the terms from Alexander Bain (1866), through Genung (1872), Wendell (1891), Scott and Denny (1893), up to Harold Martin (1958) whose book, *The Logic and Rhetoric of Exposition*, stresses a philosophical approach to the rhetoric of the paragraph with the hope, to quote from the preface, that the student will be led "to something better than desultory acceptance of imposed dicta about form." No decision was reached regarding the efficacy of the terms to help define and teach the paragraph. The group, however, did not express much skepticism,

for, it was felt, basic rhetorical terminology is needed for teaching the paragraph as a basic unit of communication. Though a finished writer may scarcely be aware of *unity*, *coherence*, and *emphasis* as he writes, the beginning writer needs some terms, some concepts with which to be instructed.

The third general question concerned methods of paragraph development: "How effectively do the textbooks describe the methods of paragraph development? Do the terms *comparison*, *contrast*, *space*, *time*, etc., really oversimplify the actual process?" Again, the group felt that for beginning writers rhetorical terminology was necessary. As one participant remarked, the absence of broad reading experience of most students requires "mechanical discipline of methods." Some felt, however, that the textbooks present the methods too absolutely, not emphasizing the importance of a combination of methods. As for the examples in the texts, Mr. Albaugh reported that for the most part, the textbooks used timely models from current professional writing. The group consensus did not necessarily favor this practice.

The next question was, "Have our discussions of introductory, transitional, and concluding paragraphs become too artificial?" Most participants agreed that these paragraphs are difficult to teach, with stiltedness often the result when formal terms are used. Related to this topic was the feeling that transitional devices (including sentence and paragraph transitions) have to be taught freshmen, but that organic transition arising out of the logical and rhythmic movement of both the paragraph and the paper is more desirable. Another observation introduced at this point was that modern trends of the journalistic paragraph pose the problem of the length of the para-

graph. The workshop concluded that the writer's purpose and the audience largely determine the length.

Finally, the workshop turned to the questions, "What attitude should be taken toward the writing of the paragraph in the composition courses, and what techniques have been successful?" The following suggestions came out of the discussion. (1) The majority of the members reported that they do ask their students to write isolated paragraphs, but a common practice was to begin with the writing of a "diagnostic theme." (2) Teaching the topic sentence is a "safe" method of developing mastery of the paragraph. (3) The study of elementary logic should help to improve paragraph development. (4) The careful study of the rhetoric of the paragraph should help to avoid the empty theme, but the emphasis should be upon the theme as a whole. Finally, of all the suggestions, two received rather emphatic endorsement: First, the entire theme (often a student theme) should be present when paragraphs are analyzed. Second, the group strongly advocated the use of the opaque projector in the teaching of the paragraph and the whole composition.

Although the workshop was basically exploratory, the group seemed to believe that the paragraph is a unit of composition that can be analyzed with available rhetorical terms, though fresh approaches and different emphasis may be needed. The terms help the beginner, as well as the more proficient student, to analyze weaknesses; the concepts can be taught. There was, however, considerable agreement that the analysis and the teaching

of paragraphs must continually involve a consideration of the whole theme, its progression, logic, rhythm, and purpose.

Chairman: Leo L. Van Scyoc, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Co-Chairman: Allan R. Davis, Hofstra College, Hempstead, New York

Secretary: Waters E. Turpin, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

Co-Secretary: Ralph M. Albaugh, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute

Resource: Jerome Fischer, Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania

Ilse D. Lind, Washington Square College, New York University

William C. Baker, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio

Jack C. Barnes, University of Maryland, College Park

Viola Bjorholm, Nyack Missionary College, Nyack-on-Hudson, New York

Sister Regina Clare, Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pennsylvania

John W. Clarkson, Jr., Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, New Jersey

Sister M. Cornelia, St. Joseph Academy, Columbia, Pennsylvania

Mother William Daley, Marymount College, New York City

Eugene T. Grewe, University of Detroit, Detroit

Mrs. Bernetta Jackson, Washington University, Saint Louis

Sister Mary Joanne, C.S.J., Nazareth Academy, LaGrange Park, Illinois

Edwin C. Kirkland, University of Florida, Gainesville

Margaret Miki, Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Maryland

James M. Poole, Delaware State College, Dover, Delaware

Harold Ridlon, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

Daniel J. Rogers, Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa

W. B. Schneider, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Margarth Stewart, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Joe Sutfin, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee

Sister M. Suzanne, S.C., Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pennsylvania

Cora D. Updyke, Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York

Mother Berchmans Walsh, Marymount Junior College, Arlington, Virginia

Charles M. Waters, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee

12. Articulation of Secondary School and College Work

Between forty and fifty well-articulated and very articulate college and high school English teachers and a few counselors and administrators participated in the proceedings of Workshop 12 during both sessions.

After a brief reminder that the true purpose of any program of "articulation" is to remove obstacles of whatever kind from the continuous progress of the student from school into college, the chairman invited attention to a fairly compre-

hensive agenda prepared in advance by the workshop officers and distributed among the participants. This was to be regarded not as an assignment that had to be "covered" in two sessions but as a script or musical score from which participants were to select items of greatest interest and importance and then to "sound off" freely. The ensuing Socratic discussion indicated that this group had major interest in the following three topics:

1. The advanced Placement Program of the CEEB.

2. Articulation practices in various states.

3. Teacher load in the high school.

Other matters, such as the duplication of course material, the present dubious status of non-credit remedial English courses, and the preparation and certification of English teachers, were touched upon but not developed in the rapid, sometimes inconclusive give-and-take of experience and opinion that characterized the discussion. There follows a summary of the points made and the questions raised and answered under the three headings listed above.

(1) *The Advanced Placement Program of the CEEB.*

Edward T. Wilcox of Harvard presented a proposal for the improvement of advanced placement—a series of summer demonstration courses for potential teachers of the advanced courses in secondary schools, such demonstrations to be conducted by Harvard instructors. To this there was immediate response by Isabel Gordon of the Bronx (N.Y.) High School of Science, who took exception to the college instructors. Secondary schools now cooperating with the program, she thought, were capable of developing their own courses and selecting the teachers qualified to teach them. The superior teachers of such college-level

courses need no demonstration of what is required for their success; they could conduct such demonstrations themselves. It was brought out that many high schools are developing "honors" courses of college-level quality for gifted pupils (at least in senior year) and that they have the right teachers for them. Frank S. Hook of Lehigh expressed the warning that it would be deplorable if high schools established so-called "honors" courses merely to "get on the band wagon." The rejoinder to this was that to attribute such an intention to the schools may have been *surmised* by certain colleges on the basis of the frequent requests for college assistance in establishing CEB Advanced Placement Programs from teachers who lack knowledge of the Program's purpose and scope and are not prepared for conducting it. The ETS examinations of the APP are the product of the cooperative efforts of school and college subject-matter teachers—an example of a vital form of articulation. Workshop members underscored the value of such school and college cooperation in the solution of all mutual problems.

The relative merits of advanced placement (ETS-CEEB) and acceleration (Ford) for able students were brought into question, some participants expressing doubt that advanced placement was more acceptable to the colleges than acceleration, since many colleges set up their own testing programs regardless. Ancillary to this was the question whether successful candidates were simply placed in advanced freshman sections or were "accelerated" into sophomore status. Partial answers were provided to these questions. Basically, the purpose of the APP is to simplify the task of preparing students for college by promulgating a unified set of standards; in theory, at least, this precludes the need for individual testing programs, although many colleges do supplement with their own.

Several persons well acquainted with the APP stated that, since 1954, there had been a steady increase in the number of schools, colleges and students participating, and that many students were able to reduce their college programs to three years. Naturally, the whole matter is "tied in" with the admissions policies of individual colleges as well as with the results on CEEB examinations. (The 1956 issue of CEEB's "Advanced Placement Program—the so-called Acorn booklet—contains descriptions of the college-level courses and examinations in English composition and literature.)

(2) *Articulation Practices in Various States*

This phase of the discussion revealed two things: (1) that state-level committees or workshops on articulation are on the increase; and (2) that the uninformed members of this workshop were deeply interested in learning the details of their organization and activity, and the informed members were eager to share their experience with these state-wide movements. This subject has been treated in every CCCC conference (whether on panel or in workshop) since 1950. As these discussions shift from region to region within ever-changing groups, some repetition does occur of material published in preceding issues of *College Composition and Communication*, but at the same time there is expression of new points of view and of fresh experience.

Workshop 12 focused attention on the following items:

(a) *Intervisitation of school and college instructors.* In New Jersey intervisitation days on college campuses and in high schools have taken place for several years, usually on the initiation of college presidents or high school principals. Instructors visit each other's classes in the morning and have conferences on mutual problems in the afternoon. Though no actual studies of concrete results have

yet been made, there is a general feeling that these day-long interchanges do produce considerable good will and understanding in both camps. Guidance counselors, principals, and college admissions officers participate in the discussions.

In Illinois, as reported by Frank R. Moaks of the University of Illinois, an extensive plan operates under the direction of Dr. Roberts. Several weeks prior to visiting the university, Illinois high school teachers submit student writing to university staff members who grade the papers by university standards. When high school teachers arrive on the campus, they not only visit university classes and meet in integrated discussion groups, but also consult with the instructors who graded the papers. With this arrangement it is possible for both groups to practically demonstrate standards of their respective levels of teaching.

A similar program in West Virginia was reported by Lorena Kemp of West Virginia State College. West Virginia's Articulation Workshop has engaged in appraisal of high school papers, consultation about grading standards, establishment of "minimum essentials" acceptable on both levels, and curriculum revision.

Michigan, Tennessee, and Iowa reported other existing intervisitation plans. For twenty years, J. N. Hook reported, Michigan teachers have been exchanging posts to teach and observe. In Tennessee a coordinator at the University of Tennessee is granted released time to serve as consultant in public schools, lead discussions, and assist in the preparation of minimum standards. Iowa State Teachers College employs a similar consultation service, sending out teachers to conduct night classes, supervise daytime teaching, lead one-day workshops, or establish consultation programs lasting several days.

(b) *Boston University's recent conference on articulation* was described by Floyd Rinker, who for many years has

done much effective work in this field in Newton, Massachusetts, and throughout the state.

(c) In New York, Strang Lawson of Colgate reported, Education departments sponsor "study councils" and, although there are few intervisitation days as such, high school English teachers are welcomed into the project. New York's Articulation Committee was set up very recently.

(3) Teacher Load.

This hardy perennial of articulation discussions bloomed profusely in this workshop, as it usually does whenever and wherever composition teachers foregather. What follows is a condensed summary of the direction and mood (unmistakably warm) of the discussion during the whole of the second session. J. N. Hook (University of Illinois and an officer of NCTE) took a strong and impassioned lead in the deliberations here summarized:

(a) The reduction of class size to 25 and of weekly class hours to 4 (for each of 5 English classes) was set up as a virtual demand upon administrators who arrange such matters in our schools, despite the difficulties encountered in current teacher shortages and in state certification requirements for "qualified" teachers.

Steps already taken are encouraging. Wisconsin teachers, for example, found assistance in the state department of public instruction. Montana has a regulation that high school English teachers should teach no more than four classes and 125 students. In Illinois standards of certification have been raised from 16 to 24 hours in English, and a certification publication recommends that teachers teach no more than 5 classes of 30 students each. If loads are reduced, will this not necessitate more teachers and thus result in lowering certification standards? In reply to this question J. N.

Hook observed that a recent NEA study showed that as standards rise, the number of available teachers increases.

(b) To read and mark weekly themes (for a maximum of 125 students) is an obligation that cannot be shifted to the shoulders of aids or assistants, nor shirked by neglect, nor avoided by mechanical expedients; it is the English teacher's essential professional skill and the foundation of his professional competence.

In this connection the excellent study of William J. Dusel of San Jose State College, California, "Determining an Efficient Teaching Load in English," was urgently recommended. This is available in the *Illinois English Bulletin* (October, 1955, in the NY English Council's *The English Record* (Spring, 1956), and is procurable from NCTE.

It was brought out that the dropping of college remedial sections may exert pressure on administrators to help English teachers teach more effectively by having fewer students.

(c) To enlist the support of non-English-teaching colleagues in the campaign for lighter loads is not a stratagem of self-interest but a call for professional cooperation in a task that concerns the whole staff—the development of the student's power to write well about important and significant subjects.

Floyd Rinker reported that in Newton, Massachusetts, cooperation between departments enabled English teachers to achieve four-class loads, with extracurricular assignments optional (and remunerative).

Professor Hook proposed and the workshop promptly adopted the following recommendations:

1. That CCCC, NCTE, and the 142 affiliates of the National Council undertake a study of the effective utilization of teachers' time on both the college and the high school level.

2. That as a part of this study a written statement be prepared, under the

sponsorship of the NCTE, calling to public attention that the unavoidable consequence of teacher overload is that English teachers are forced to "shortchange" the students.

At the end of the session the workshop endorsed without formal action the recent NCTE recommendation of a maximum class size of 25 students.

Chairman: W. Paul Hamilton, Montclair Teachers College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey
Co-Chairman: James D. Gordon, Central High School, Philadelphia
Secretary: Helen J. Throckmorton, University of Wichita, Kansas
Co-Secretary: Marian Rodney, Moorestown High School, Moorestown, New Jersey
Resource: Floyd Rinker, Boston, Massachusetts
Clarence A. Brown, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Sister Mary Aquin, Caldwell College, Caldwell, New Jersey
Sister M. Clarita, Ursuline College, Louisville, Kentucky
Sister Marie Estelle, I.H.M., Little Flower High School, Philadelphia
Sister Mary Good Counsel, I.H.M., Little Flower High School, Philadelphia
Anna L. Baker, West Chester Sr. High, West Chester, Pennsylvania
Margaret Baker, Salem Jr. High, Salem, Ohio
H. Elizabeth Bold, Haverford Township High, Havertown, Pennsylvania
Lurene C. Brown, Ohio University, Athens
Eugene J. Brzenk, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois
Howard Carlisle, Roxborough High, Philadelphia
Edwin R. Clapp, University of Utah, Salt Lake City

John Cowley, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
Wallace W. Douglas, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Ernestine R. DuPont, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
Isabel S. Gordon, Bronx High School of Science, New York City
Jocelyn P. Goss, Virginia State College, Norfolk
Dorothy H. Gould, Westtown School, Westtown, Pennsylvania
Irwin Griggs, Temple University, Philadelphia
Mrs. Ruth M. Harris, State Teachers College, Edinbow, Pennsylvania
Frank S. Hook, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
J. N. Hook, University of Illinois, Urbana
Moreen C. Jordan, University of Illinois, Chicago
Lorena E. Kemp, West Virginia State College, Institute
Strang Lawson, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York
Fred K. Lingle, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
George F. McFarland, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York
Priscilla R. Morton, Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania
Frank R. Moake, University of Illinois, Urbana
Madge Nickerson, Haverford High, Havertown, Pennsylvania
H. W. Reninger, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
M. A. Shaaber, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
Myles Slatin, University of Buffalo, New York
R. E. Tuttle, General Motors Institute, Flint, Michigan
Wanda G. Walker, Arkansas State College, State College
Harold N. White, New Mexico Western College, Silver City
Edward T. Wilcox, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Eloise Wilson, Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey

13. Entrance and Placement Tests: Their Value and Limitations

In this two-session workshop, very little attempt was made to discuss questions relating specifically to entrance or to placement tests separately, for, despite somewhat differing purposes, both kinds of tests offer similar problems to administrators and to English departments.

There was, however, one problem which dealt almost exclusively with entrance tests and entrance standards: determining what may be the best indicator of probable college success of incoming freshmen. Several workshop members declared that their colleges have found that a student's high school record is a

more dependable indicator of probable college success than entrance tests, which are used to give supporting indication of probable success. Such colleges are usually small ones, or, if large, they are colleges which draw students almost exclusively from nearby communities whose high schools are of a known character. Other workshop members, particularly those from large universities, felt quite positively that there is a poor correlation between a student's high school record and his probable success in college. They preferred to use some kind of an objective test plus an impromptu

them
place
mech
readi
these
in ag
mean
stude
pecia
of du
tests
Schol
Psych
can C
Exam
Tests
the t
eau.
lems,
dents
find
tests.

Th
work
prom
lems
one a
a deg
so; th
to ag
accep
after
pecte
ers d
tincti
hono
them
entra
Ge
that
readi
the l

At
ticip
feren
tutio

theme, not only for entrance but also for placement. The objective test may be a mechanics test, a usage test, a "proof-reading" test, or any combination of these. Workshop members were generally in agreement that these tests were by no means completely valid indicators of a student's ability to write; they felt, especially, that the "proofreading" test was of dubious value. Some of the objective tests widely used are the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Tests, the Ohio State Psychological Examinations, the American Council of Education Psychological Examinations, the College Qualifying Tests, the Cooperative English Tests, and the tests by the California Testing Bureau. Some colleges with special problems, such as those having many students with foreign language background, find it necessary to construct their own tests.

The most fully discussed topics in the workshop concerned the value of the impromptu theme as a test and the problems of administering such a test. Everyone agreed that giving such a test was to a degree burdensome, but not excessively so; that readers of the themes can come to agreement on the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable writing after a little discussion of what is expected of incoming freshmen; that readers do not concur as readily on the distinction between acceptable writing and honors writing; and that impromptu themes are valued highly, whether for entrance or for placement.

General agreement was also reached that almost any test, including the "proof-reading" test, is a reliable indicator of the bottom 20% of an incoming class.

Hence discovering what students may have to go into a remedial course is not difficult. However, objective tests were felt to be less reliable indicators of the upper 10% or 15% of an incoming class, which group might be placed in an advanced or honors course, although most colleges use such tests to make this discrimination.

On the whole, workshop members considered the discussions valuable not because they found solutions to their problems, but because they discovered how others are trying to solve similar problems and learned of the relative success or failure of these attempts.

Chairman: George Schick, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
Co-Chairman: Col. Peter R. Moody, U. S. Air Force Academy, Denver, Colorado
Secretary: James E. White, Rhode Island College of Education, Providence
Co-Secretary: James Green, State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Resource: Edward Anderson, Educational Testing Service, Princeton
 Harold Reppert, Temple University, Philadelphia
 Robert Heath, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
 Paul M. Bechtel, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois
 Clarence Derrick, University of Florida, Gainesville
 Rev. Jos. I. Dirvin, C.M., St. John's University, New York City
 Sister Mary Dolores, Gwynedd Mercy Jr. College, Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania
 Frank Hook, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
 Marretta S. King, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
 P. Link, Boston University
 George McElroy, Indiana University, Gary Center
 Regina B. O'Neill, Yeadon High School
 James S. Smoot, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania
 Jane W. Stedman, Roosevelt University, Chicago
 Helen Turner, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus
 Jack Venewa, Pace College, New York City

14. *Use of the Individual Conference in Teaching Composition/Communication*

At the opening of the meeting the participants were asked to describe the conference systems customary at their institutions. It was found that the number of

conferences varied from one or two a term per student at the teacher's discretion to a required conference with each student every two weeks. The length of

a conference varies from ten minutes to an hour. Only a few departments made no provision at all for conferences.

It was recognized that conferences involve certain dangers and disadvantages. They take much time; they put an additional burden of responsibility on the instructor, they encourage students to seek sympathy rather than instruction. On the other hand, it was felt that many cases occur where the opportunity for individual attention provided by the conference justified itself. It was generally felt that conferences are useful in dealing with students who were markedly superior or inferior but that they do not seem to have much effect on the work of average students.

There was some difference of opinion as to the length to which instructors conferring with students should go in the direction of general counselling. The need for help of this kind was recognized, but it was generally agreed that students who are prevented from doing effective work by personality difficulties ought to be referred to advisers who are equipped to help them. It was pointed out, however, that the conference, coming as it does early in the student's freshman year, provided an ideal opportunity for spotting and referring such students.

The conference usually occupied a position in the experimental programs that were reported to be in progress. One participant reported that in his department classes in writing were, in effect, disbanded after the first few weeks so that instruction could be continued on an individual basis. Another described a loose and changing system in which one or two of three weekly meetings could be set aside so that conferences could be held. In another variant small discussion groups were found to be more effective, in some ways, than individual conferences. One participant described a method by which the opaque projector could be used in a class as a whole to carry on

some of the detailed correction and discussion generally associated with conference teaching.

It was concluded that:

1) The policy of conferring with each student on a regular schedule is likely to be wasteful. Conferences should be held at the instructor's discretion.

2) It would, it follows, be natural for the instructor to limit his conference appointments to students who would clearly benefit from individual attention; these would be the better and the poorer students.

3) The content of conferences should be limited to matters of composition and communication and whatever personal or moral questions might bear directly upon the work of the course, and should not encroach upon the domains of the general counselor or spiritual adviser.

Chairman: Jacob Korg, University of Washington, Seattle

Co-Chairman: Allan G. Chester, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Secretary: David Ruffin, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

Co-Secretary: Christian Hewitt, Pennsylvania State University Center, Altoona

Resource: Richard Stang, City College of New York

Gordon Wilson, Miami University, Florida

Sister M. Aquin, Caldwell College, Caldwell, New Jersey

Viola Bjorholm, Nyack Missionary College, Nyack, New York

Elizabeth B. Brown, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia

Frank J. Chiarenza, University of Hartford, Connecticut

Robert M. Dell, Pace College, New York City

Katherine Gordon, American International College, Springfield, Massachusetts

Amos B. Horlacher, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Seymour Lainoff, Yeshiva College, New York City

J. S. Locher, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania

Isabel K. Patterson, State Teachers College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania

Raymond L. Pery, University of Toledo, Ohio

Clarice E. Pierson, Texas Southern University, Houston

James R. Randall, Boston University, Massachusetts

Paul N. Siegel, Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York

Robert Alston Smith, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

Lee L. Snyder, Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia

Donald L. Young, Boston University, Massachusetts

15. *The Freshman Handbook: A Close Look*

As a preliminary to the general discussion, the participants had agreed that the term *handbook* should be understood to include not only the handbook proper—a manual designed primarily for reference—but also the “rhetoric”—a composition text arranged for systematic classroom discussion; in actual practice the two are not always readily distinguishable, and most texts are adaptable to either purpose. Omnibuses and handbook-anthology combinations were not discussed. While the agenda as originally conceived places emphasis on the more practical and mechanical aspects of the preparation and use of handbooks, the workshop participants showed a greater interest in the broader problems of composition teaching as these affected the handbook, and the discussion reported here reflects this shift of emphasis.

Among the practical problems discussed was the question of size; the group seemed inclined to reject both bulky, over-detailed books and those which were extremely concise. Certainly a handbook which covers only matters of grammar would not find ready acceptance; at the very least some consideration of such larger matters as organization would be demanded. Several members of the group were friendly to the inclusion of work on formal logic, although, as one handbook author confessed, the treatment might consist of a cursory discussion prepared without any very expert knowledge.

An informal poll revealed that a variety of books was used by the departments represented and that several departments were inclined to change handbooks frequently. Though such changes may reflect shifts in personnel, they may also reflect a desire to take account of new trends in linguistics. The “new linguistics” was discussed at some length, but although such studies received proper respect as scientific attempts to under-

stand the workings of language, there was little hope that the new methods of analysis would be practical for classroom use in the near future.

There was a fair amount of skepticism concerning the traditional handling of grammar in the handbooks and composition courses. Several members of the group favored excluding the systematic study of grammar from the composition course in favor of occasional conference work as needed; this would imply the use of a handbook rather than a rhetoric. The general opinion favored, at the least, a systematic study of terminology to provide a common vocabulary for teacher and student. The respect for traditional rules shown by authors of handbooks aroused a certain amount of criticism; although such rules are often artificial and trivial and of little relevance to the teaching of effective writing, they are generally recorded even in the more liberal textbooks. While one member offered a strong defense of the traditional grammar as an attempt to impose some degree of logic and consistency on the chaos of usage, other members of the group were reluctant to go against normal educated usage even when it is slightly illogical, as, for instance, in the disputed “he-is-one-of-those-who-is” construction. In the end it seemed to be assumed that, although most composition teachers today accept usage as the final standard, yet the handbook must provide some rules for beginning writers whose tastes are still undeveloped and who might take usage as simply an excuse for carelessness. While some participants considered a fairly informal style as most appropriate for student writing, there was no doubt that the norm to be provided by the handbook was that of decent standard English. One member of the group doubted whether our repeated attacks on jargon were really profitable, since most of our students were too im-

mature to have acquired intellectual affectations.

The general trend of the discussion was not likely to provide much cheer for authors and publishers of handbooks. Except for the minority which was prepared to defend a common-sense version of the traditional grammar, the teachers present seemed to be torn between a theoretical respect for the new linguistics and the doctrine of usage on the one hand and the old terminology and rules on the other. Having partly lost their faith in the old system, they still feared that a complete abandonment of it would lead to chaos. In such a situation, the author of a handbook, unless he limits his market to the extreme right or left, will inevitably be forced into some kind of uneasy compromise between the old and the new. The success of a book may very well depend on the taste and common sense with which the synthesis is effected.

Chairman: John C. Sherwood, University of Oregon, Oregon

Co-Chairman: Robert Schweik, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Secretary: Lawrence Hyman, Brooklyn College, New York City

Co-Secretary: Edith Layer, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Resource: William W. Watt, Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania

Robert H. Moore, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

J. Carter Rowland, Gannon College, Erie, Pennsylvania

Jerome Archer, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Mildred Buxill, Harcourt, Brace, and Company

Richard Beal, Boston University, Massachusetts

Charles E. Blackburn, State College of Washington, Pullman

F. E. Bowman, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina

J. E. Case, Macmillan Company

Francis Christensen, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

James L. Donovan, American Book Company

Wallace Douglas, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Karl Dykema, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio

Meta R. Emberger, University of Louisville, Kentucky

Francis Ekins, Scott, Foresman Company

George Grise, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee

John C. Hodges, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Harry P. Kroiter, University of Buffalo, New York

Eleanor Lane, Arkansas State College, State College

Louis Locke, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia

G. A. Middendorf, Harper & Brothers

Anthony Nania, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Carol Oppenheimer, Scott, Foresman Company

Charles Pettie, Oxford University Press

William A. Pullin, Harcourt, Brace & Company

Niel Snortum, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Paul R. Sullivan, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Howard P. Vincent, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago

Howard Warrington, Prentice-Hall, Inc.

16. Increasing Students' Vocabulary

The new workshop on "Increasing Students' Vocabulary" opened with a statement by the chairman that the officers' preconvention correspondence and investigations had resulted in (1) an approximation of the percentage of colleges and universities offering courses in word study, (2) an annotated bibliography of fifty items illustrative of various types among vocabulary aids, (3) an annotated bibliography of selected articles on vocabulary development from recent magazines and journals, and (4) a tentative outline for inquiry into the present efforts to aid students in making their vo-

cabularies meet college requirements.

The number of colleges and universities offering credit courses, designated variously as "Greek and Latin Word Roots," "Scientific Terminology," "Vocabulary Building," was estimated at about twenty percent. The percentage is based on an examination of only 330 representative college bulletins.

The two bibliographies, one prepared by each Resource Officer, contain useful comments on the books and articles. The chairman has some copies which may be obtained by sending six cents postage.

The discussion in the areas of inquiry attempted to answer five questions:

What is the *situation* immediate to the instructor?

What *measure of classroom time* is devoted to improving vocabulary?

What *methods and materials* are being used?

What *classroom equipment* is in use?

What *evaluations* are being attempted?

The question of *situation* was studied in two parts. The first part concerned the two- and three-hour courses set up; the second concerned the first-year English course.

There were five schools represented which have courses set up for word study in specific curriculums. Those in pre-medicine were apparently successful as long as only pre-medical students were allowed to enroll. One instructor had had the experience of having had the class thrown open to all who wished to enroll. The section was overcrowded with business students whose failures added to the usual number brought the total failures to one-third the total number of students enrolled. Another instructor found it difficult to get a class of nurses to see that they needed the vocabulary offered.

In the discussion of the second phase of the *situation*—that concerned with increasing vocabulary as an unavoidable hurdle in the freshman course—almost without exception participants manifested concern over student inadequacy. One participant's concern appeared mounting to despair. If she didn't give long and exacting assignments in word study, the students did not improve appreciably; if she did, they were stymied. Only a very few instructors reported a marked degree of success in measurable attainments by freshmen.

The question of *time* spent in instruction in the freshman course was definitely answered as ranging from six and two-

thirds to fifty-five percent of the total time of the term's work.

The discussion of *methods and materials* made clear that there were two basic approaches to vocabulary improvement.

The one set up word-study procedures by furnishing lists of words largely unrelated to and certainly not coming from any larger division of materials, such as reading.

Practices discussed and criticisms offered are:

- 1) The use of dictionaries for the study of words in furnished lists, i.e., out of context. The warning was given that such study often leads to a student's accepting the meaning of the parent word and ending with that, or with any definition given first.
- 2) The use of instructor-supplied lists for gaining facility in finding words. Here the lists serve a limited purpose of drill. There was no consensus about the use.
- 3) The use of lists of affixes and common roots. This practice was generally considered worth while. Greek roots were reported as being more profitable for study than Latin.
- 4) Utilizing the "sixty-word" lists furnished by instructors in other departments, particularly in social science. No encouragement was offered.
- 5) Devising mechanical drills for emphasizing forms and idioms. The idea was doubtfully received.

The practices of the second approach to *methods and materials* center in word study requisite to understanding assigned reading and to expressing ideas orally and in writing. The discussion revealed a great variety of detailed procedures and considerable doubt about which were most worth while. Some of the practices discussed and for the most part approved are:

- 1) Using chapters and smaller divisions devoted to word study in text-books of

readings. These are more often than not carefully related sets of exercises requiring the student to make decisions about meanings intended by the writer.

2) Requiring the student to give the dictionary number of the definition applying to his use of a word.

3) Requiring students to keep tabulations of corrected spellings, pronunciations, and examples of uses in notebooks.

4) Assigning a preview of new words chosen by the instructor as necessary to understanding a difficult unit of reading in a new field.

5) Demonstrating in reading exercises that contexts do not always make meanings clear.

6) Making vocabulary a vital part of assignments, such as in writing description, or even a theme on a word.

7) Frequently testing the meaning of words in such way as to stimulate discussion.

8) Relating the imaging of words to 'learning words.'

9) Keeping a full reference shelf of interesting, attractive books for browsing among words.

10) Making sure that no student is burdened by new and difficult words to the extent that he ceases to try.

Discussion of *equipment* included the uses of opaque projectors, charts, instructor-made slides and graphs, tape recorders, record players, and various other classroom aids. Student workers were represented as an essential part of the equipment for the classroom. More than one participant expressed doubts about instructors knowing how to get maximum benefits from equipment available.

The question of *evaluations* of the results of vocabulary instruction was barely broached when the allotted time ran out.

Workshop 16, 1958, recommended that it be succeeded by a second

Workshop on "Increasing Students' Vocabulary" and bequeathed the study of *evaluations*, entire, to the Workshop envisioned for March 1959.

Chairman: Gladys K. Brown, Little Rock University, Arkansas

Co-Chairman: Carl Lefevre, Chicago Teachers College

Secretary: William F. Belcher, North Texas State College, Denton

Co-Secretary: Julia F. Sherbourne, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Resource: Lizette VanGelder, Howard College, Birmingham, Alabama
Bryson Jaynes, Washington State College, Pullman

Lane R. Betz, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia
Florence Butler, Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York
M. Buxill, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, N. Y.

Sister Joseph Carmel, S.S.J., St. Mary's Academy, Philadelphia

Sister Mary Carolyn, C.S.J., Rosary College, River Falls, Illinois

Mary E. Cox, West Liberty State College, West Virginia

Robert W. Cumberland, The Cooper Union, New York City

Vivian L. Davenport, Woodbury High School, New Jersey

Sister M. Editha, S.S.J., St. Mary's Academy, Philadelphia

Meta Riley Emberger, University of Louisville, Kentucky

Lucile P. Folk, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston

Ruth V. Furniss, Louisville Public Schools, Kentucky

Judith E. Hinton, Woodbury High School, New Jersey

Gladys T. Jackson, Talladega College, Alabama

Joan Kerchensky, St. John's College, Cleveland, Ohio

Nora Landmark, Michigan State University, East Lansing

Norman L. Lawrence, Philadelphia Technical Institute

Ralph D. Lindeman, Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania

J. W. McKay, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Harold G. Ridlon, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

Chung-Wen Shih, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut

Carle B. Spotts, State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Lawrence G. Stamps, Maryland State College, Princess Anne

Paul R. Sullivan, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

Ralph S. Wehner, Thiel College, Greenville, Pennsylvania

Ronald A. Wells, U. S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Connecticut

H. Allen Wycherley, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

James E. Yokel, Rochester Institute of Technology, New York

Secretary's Report No. 20

JOSEPH A. ROGERS¹

Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Indiana Room, Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 28, 1957, 12:15 to 4:20 p.m.

Previous to the formal opening of the meeting, Harold Allen, Second Vice-President of NCTE, addressed the members briefly, inviting consideration of two proposals:

1) that the Placement Service of the CCCC be activated during the convention of NCTE;

2) that a summer workshop be instituted at which promising graduates who have majored in English would be trained for full-time teaching programs in Freshman English.

1. Chairman Francis Shoemaker presided. Members present were as follows: Tuttle, Kitzhaber, Sutton, Morgan, Ward, Adler, Fowler, Reisman, Stryker, (substituting for Wise), Singleton, Grommon, Hook, McCrimmon, Blue, Steinberg, Stabley, Kallsen, Reninger, Ives, Bowman, Bryant, Prausnitz, Calderwood, and Beal.

2. The proposed agenda for the meeting were presented by the chairman and adopted.

3. A motion was made, seconded, and passed that the reading of the minutes of the last meeting be dispensed with.

4. Associate Chairman Tuttle presented a report on the Spring Meeting.

5. Leon Reisman welcomed the group to Minneapolis and reported that arrangements for the CCCC Luncheon Session on the following day were complete.

6. The type of meal to be served at future CCCC Executive Committee luncheon meetings was discussed. The suggestion that the CCCC assume finan-

cial responsibility for this function was advanced and considered, but no definite action towards this end was taken. The chairman proposed that the officer in charge of future luncheon arrangements may wish to poll membership of the Executive Committee to ascertain their wishes regarding the menu.

7. Assistant Chairman Albert Kitzhaber passed out copies of the tentative program for the convention in Philadelphia, March 27-29. He reported that eighty persons invited to participate have already accepted, and requested nominations from the Executive Committee for filling places on the program. The March program was briefly discussed.

8. Chairman Shoemaker introduced Professor Stryker, who is substituting at this meeting for J. Hooper Wise.

9. Treasurer Hook reported a balance in the treasury as of November 1, 1957, of \$4,519.54. Membership in the CCCC reached a peak during the 1956-1957 period of 1656. Treasurer Hook filed with the Secretary a report giving additional financial and membership data.

10. Frank Bowman, Editor, reported on sources of articles presented in *College Composition and Communication*.

11. The motion was made, seconded, and passed that *College English* be requested to publish a complete bibliography of works in the composition field.

12. Frank Bowman presented names of several person as possible members of the CCC Editorial Board. Associate Chairman Tuttle proposed that Editor Bowman select persons from among these names for the Editorial Board.

13. Chairman Shoemaker reported that James J. Lynch has agreed to serve as Local Chairman of the 1959 CCCC Spring Meeting in San Francisco. Alfred Grommon remarked that California Eng-

lish societies have manifested great interest in this convention.

14. Associate Chairman Tuttle predicted a successful meeting in Cincinnati in 1960 and announced that Gordon Wilson has accepted the position of Local Chairman for this convention. He added that the Sheraton-Gibson and the Netherland-Hilton were eager to serve as host-hotel and that a hotel selection would soon be made.

15. Chairman Shoemaker suggested that some thought should be given to the selection of a Local Chairman of the 1961 convention. He remarked that the Morrison Hotel, which has proved satisfactory for past meetings, is eager to serve as the host-hotel in 1961.

16. Chairman Shoemaker announced the membership of the Committee on Proposals as follows: Ralph Singleton, chairman, Mary Elizabeth Fowler, Alfred Grommon, George Arms, John Weimer, Margaret Blicke, Irwin Griggs.

17. The motion was made, seconded, and passed that the Chairman write to Kenneth W. Houpp requesting that the proposal of the Interim Committee on National Standards in Composition and Communication regarding standards and accreditation in English when placed in final form be submitted to the Chairman of the CCCC Executive Committee for transmission to the Committee on Proposals for consideration.

18. Sumner Ives presented a report of the Committee on Practical Applications of Linguistics. He suggested that, as an immediate project, a few tapes be prepared which present basic information on the role of pitch, stress, and juncture in English structure, and, further, that the more ambitious program which has been discussed be held in abeyance for the present. The sense of the meeting was approval of this suggestion. Erwin Steinberg suggested that the committee be enlarged to include more persons who are

not specifically identified with the field of linguistics itself.

19. Chairman Shoemaker proposed that some remuneration be granted the Editor of the CCCC. After some discussion, the motion was made, seconded, and passed that \$500 be paid annually to the CCCC Editor.

20. Chairman Shoemaker raised the question of an honorarium for the luncheon speaker, Marshall McLuhan. After some discussion, the motion was made, seconded, and passed that \$150 be paid to Marshall McLuhan.

21. Secretary Rogers reported a proposal of the Committee on Placement Service that some assistance be provided to the Placement Officer during the Spring meeting. The motion was made, seconded, and passed that the Local Chairman designate a person to assist the Placement Officer during the annual convention.

22. Richard Beal reported that the Committee on Membership is continuing its activity and is hopeful of enlarging the West Coast membership of the CCCC subsequent to the San Francisco convention.

23. Erwin Steinberg stated that Volume IV dealing with the college teaching of English will be issued after Volume V by the NCTE Curriculum Committee. The desirability of having someone connected with the CCCC included in the group preparing the volume on college teaching was discussed. A motion was made, seconded, and passed that a CCCC member be among those working on this volume.

24. Chairman Shoemaker reminded the meeting of Harold Allen's proposal regarding a summer workshop for preparing teachers of Freshman English, a proposal laid before the group shortly before the formal opening of the meeting. After some discussion during which a willingness to encourage the project

was m
onded
shoul
ner C

The
was h
of the
at 12:
Chair
Chair
ficers
at the
CCCC

Cha
seph
the re
Assist
Legi
Execu
Univ
A
Pr
G
W
K

Libe
N
G

Mir
mittee
sition
Frank
vania
a.m.

1. C
introc
gett,

was manifest, a motion was made, seconded and passed that the proposal should properly be placed before Warner G. Rice's NCTE Committee on

Teacher Preparation.

25. The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Secretary's Report No. 21

JOSEPH A. ROGERS

The November 1957 Luncheon Session was held in the Michigan-Indiana Room of the Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, at 12:15 p.m. on Friday, November 29, Chairman Francis Shoemaker presiding. Chairman Shoemaker introduced the officers and the guest, Marshall McLuhan, at the speakers' table and greeted the CCCC members and guests.

Chairman Shoemaker introduced Joseph Rogers, Secretary, who announced the results of the 1957 CCCC elections:

Assistant Chairman (one-year term): Glenn Leggett, University of Washington

Executive Committee (three-year term)

Universities:

Allen Chester, University of Pennsylvania

Priscilla Tyler, Western Reserve University

George Stout, Washington University

William Buckler, New York University

Kenneth Knickerbocker, University of Tennessee

Liberal Arts Colleges:

Nick Aaron Ford, Morgan State College

G. A. Peck, Brooklyn College

Teachers Colleges:

George Smock, Terre Haute

Junior Colleges:

Beverly Fisher, Santa Monica

Samuel Weingarten, Wright

Technical Schools:

David Malone, Auburn

After announcing the results of the 1957 balloting, Secretary Rogers, who is also Placement Officer of CCCC, announced that the Placement Service would be available from 4 to 6 that afternoon in the Detroit Room.

Chairman Shoemaker presented Marshall McLuhan of the University of Toronto, who spoke on "The Meaning of the New Media for the College English Teacher."¹ After his talk Mr. McLuhan answered several questions pertinent to his remarks.

The session adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

¹Mr. McLuhan's talk was printed in *College Composition and Communication*, February, 1958, pp. 16-20, under the title "Speed of Cultural Change."

Secretary's Report No. 22

JOSEPH A. ROGERS

Minutes, Meeting of Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication, Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 27, 1958, 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 a.m.

1. Chairman Robert Tuttle, presiding, introduced the members present: Leggett, Crosby, Bowman, Cosper, Wein-

garten, Chester, Bickle, Malone, Peck, Smock, Singleton, Ward, Buckler, Wilson, Stout, Moulton, Christensen, Prausnitz, Tyler, Reninger, Hook, Wycherley, Kallsen, Ives, Rogers, Francis, McCrimmon, Sutton, Adler, Jaynes, Stabley, Ford, Morgan.

2. The motion was made, seconded, and passed dispensing with the reading

of the minutes, in as much as each member had a copy thereof. There being no emendations, they were declared approved.

3. Associate Chairman Kitzhaber reported expenditures of about \$80 for correspondence, phone calls, etc., in connection with arranging the program for the Philadelphia meeting. Associate Chairman Kitzhaber's report was accepted.

4. Assistant Chairman Leggett, combining the report of the Local Chairman with his own Progress Report on the Spring Meeting to be held in the Sheraton-Palace Hotel in San Francisco on April 2, 3, 4, 1959, announced that James Squire had assumed the position of Local Chairman in place of James Lynch, who was obliged to withdraw because of bad health. Assistant Chairman Leggett reported that the California Association of English Councils is markedly interested in our Spring Meeting and would like to cooperate closely with us, particularly in the Friday and Saturday programs. He requested that the members of the Executive Committee nominate participants in the program, adding that he hoped to draw one-third of the participants from the area east of the Mississippi. The question of special excursion rates to the San Francisco meeting was discussed. Leggett remarked that exploratory work in this direction had begun and would continue. The question of splitting financial responsibility for joint meetings with California State Association of English Councils was discussed. Leggett reported that initial proposals called for a 2/3 CCCC - 1/3 C.S.A.E.C. split on any gains or loss. The question of joint financial arrangements for the current meeting was brought into the discussion. A motion was passed empowering Local Chairman Webster to work out acceptable terms with local English teacher groups. A motion was passed empowering Assistant Chairman Leggett to ar-

range acceptable terms with the San Francisco groups for the 1959 meeting.

5. In a preliminary report on the current meeting, Local Chairman Webster remarked that twenty-two publishers had paid \$2500 for exhibit space. Registration fees, he added, would swell the total income. Expenses for mailing and for secretarial work, he estimated, would be around \$400; printing expenses would be added to this sum. The committee accepted Chairman Webster's report.

6. The rate to be charged exhibitors at future meetings was considered. After some discussion a motion was passed setting the rate of \$100 per unit. After the adoption of the motion, the suggestion was made that an adjustment in the \$100 rate be made for exhibitors who take double space. After discussion of this point, a motion was passed empowering the Local Chairman to modify the \$100 per unit rate as he saw fit in favor of exhibitors who take more than a single unit of space.

7. Treasurer Hook read the highlights from and filed with the secretary a financial report for the period 1 August 1957 to 1 March 1958. The report listed receipts of \$6,464.68 and expenditures of \$3,147.54, leaving a balance as of 1 March 1958 of \$3,317.14. Regular members on 1 March 1958 numbered 1703. Treasurer Hook's report was accepted.

8. Frank Bowman, editor of CCC, filed with the secretary a report showing that CCC Volume VIII (1957) totaled 262 pages, 20 pages more than Volume VII (1956), that Howard Dean and Robert Thorstensen had been succeeded on the Editorial Board by Francis Christensen and Harry Crosby, and that the likelihood of overlapping between CCC and CE has been minimized by amicable relations between the editors. Editor Bowman's report was accepted. A motion was made and seconded that a new cover be given to CCC by the fall issue. After some discussion, the motion was vot-

ed upon and rejected.

9. A motion was passed empowering Chairman Tuttle to appoint a committee to draw up a Handbook for Local Chairmen.

10. Gordon Wilson, Local Chairman of the 1960 Spring Meeting, reported that he was conducting negotiations with two Cincinnati hotels, the Sheraton-Gibson and the Netherland-Hilton. After some discussion of moving the 1960 meeting up a week, Chairman Tuttle authorized Local Chairman Wilson to make any adjustments in dates necessary to arrive at a settlement with the host hotel.

11. Chairman Tuttle introduced Miss Emsberger, who invited the CCCC to hold its 1962 Spring Meeting in Louisville, Kentucky. After introducing Miss Tyler, who invited the CCCC to Cleveland in 1961, Tuttle reported that invitations have been received from several other cities anxious to serve as hosts at future meetings. A motion was passed empowering Tuttle to appoint a committee to consider future convention sites. The question of periodic returns to Chicago for meetings was discussed but no action was taken.

12. Secretary Rogers reported that the Placement Service was in operation at the Spring Meeting and that, contrary to the situation at last year's meeting, the number of applicants exceeded the number of vacancies.

13. Mr. Singleton reported that the Committee on Proposals had received a proposal that the CCCC establish a permanent committee to evaluate English programs. He recommended that this suggestion should be further considered but that no definite action be taken at this time. After some discussion, a motion was passed authorizing Chairman Tuttle to appoint a special committee to consider the proposal of the ad hoc Committee *re* Standards and Accreditation and report back to the Executive Committee at November meeting in Pitts-

burgh.

14. For the Committee on Linguistic Materials, Mr. Ives reported plans for preparing several tapes that will bring out certain phonological values that could not easily be communicated in print. A motion was passed granting Mr. Ives \$25.00 covering expense of these tapes.

15. Mr. Morgan reported that the Committee on Research has examined a great amount of material compiled by Mr. Sutton, who will describe his studies in a brief paper to be submitted to *College English* and *CCC Journal*. He also reported that a study of the teaching of English is being made by the National Council of Teachers of English, Modern Language Association, and other groups with financial backing from the Ford Foundation; Professor Morgan noted the desirability of CCCC sharing in these studies. A discussion of this point ensued, in which Treasurer Hook pointed out that CCCC is in effect represented in the studies through its NCTE affiliation. After extended discussion, a motion was passed designating John Gerber as the official representative of CCCC in the studies of English teaching.

16. Chairman Tuttle distributed to the Committee a report of Eugene Grewe on a Proposed National Survey of English Programs. A motion was passed referring Mr. Grewe's report to the Committee on Proposals.

17. Chairman Tuttle terminated the existence of the Committee on Economic Basis for Freshman English, pointing out that it had been inactive for two years.

18. Chairman Tuttle thanked the members of the Executive Committee for their expeditious handling of committee business, enabling the committee to complete its work in a single morning session.

19. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

**Will you be there
when all other English teachers meet with the
National Council of Teachers of English
in the
Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, November 26-29?**

**If you are, you will enjoy
(among many other events)**

- **the annual CCCC luncheon, Friday, November 28**
- **a lecture-demonstration of Elizabethan dueling (showing how Tybalt met his death) by Colonel James L. Jackson and Major Lloyd Barnet, U. S. Air Force Academy**
- **addresses by poet Robert Hillyer, Atlantic Editor Edward Weeks, and novelist James T. Farrell**
- **a panel directed by George Arms appraising recent surveys of contemporary literary scholarship (no doubt including Lewis Leary's Contemporary Literary Scholarship and the new NCTE journal Abstracts of English Studies)**
- **a panel directed by Warner Rice on the M. A. as a teacher's degree.**

If registration materials have not reached you, write to Gerald K. Miller, Business Manager, NCTE, 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois.

Pre-registration, \$2; delayed registration, \$3

7901

ag
on

rd

ys
ng
he

r's

ld
et,